

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY



"In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh"

MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN

The Geneva Bible

CARL S. MEYER

Casework Therapy and the Clergy

ROBERT DE VRIES

Brief Studies

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXII

March 1961

No. 3

TH
—
—

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Volume XXXII

March 1961

Number 3

Published by

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH—MISSOURI SYNOD

Edited by

THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed. \$3.50 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance. Second-class postage paid at St. Louis, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A

T

Vol.

"In

The

Case

BRID

HOM

THE

BOO

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XXXII

March 1961

No. 3

"In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh." MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN	133
The Geneva Bible. CARL S. MEYER	139
Casework Therapy and the Clergy. ROBERT DeVRIES	146
BRIEF STUDIES	157
HOMILETICS	168
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	177
BOOK REVIEW	183

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER

ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER, GEORGE W. HOYER

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN, WALTER R. ROEHRS

LEWIS W. SPITZ, GILBERT A. THIELE

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
Walter R. Roehrs, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

"In

T

verse
to be
logic
"Thi
days.
with
man
But
hum
the v
done
preh
grate

Th
ades,
ulate
guag
It dic
tic t
trina
who
procl
came
creed
anath
ing
phras
of th
of C
forth
finall
adve

1 M
Four
CORD
(Dec

"In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh"

Rom. 8:3, 4

By MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN

THE Incarnation is without question the most profound mystery in the universe. That the Creator should condescend to become a creature is an event that defies logical analysis and rational explanation. "This cannot be," said the Greek of ancient days. "The infinite can not become finite without denying itself. God is God, and man is man. One cannot be the other." But God did become flesh, man, a full human being, and there is every reason in the world to call this, as Kierkegaard has done, the Great Paradox. It cannot be comprehended. It can only be received in grateful adoration.

The church spent many agonizing decades, even centuries, attempting to formulate the event of the Incarnation in language that was intelligible and useful. It did so with the metaphysical and linguistic tools at hand. It set out to be doctrinally meaningful to itself and to those who stopped long enough to listen to its proclamation. Emperors and empresses became involved in the contest for proper creedal statements. Bishops and councils anathematized each other at times for daring to differ from proposed terms and phrases. Theologians found the problem of the relationship between the two natures of Christ to be particularly difficult to set forth in human language. In fact, they finally resorted to the use of four negative adverbs, at Chalcedon,¹ as the only means

of expressing for their day the incomprehensible measure of God's condescension. This is as far as they felt it possible to go beyond the Nicene Creed, which had taken the term *σάρξ* from John's Gospel to make the participle *σαρξωθέντα* and had then gone on to invent the further participial construction *καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*.

Within recent years a new interest has arisen among theologians in the complex problem of the humanity of Jesus Christ. The psychological discoveries of Freud and Jung have had no small part in this revival of concern for a meaningful way of describing, in contemporary terms, what it means that God's Son became a man. It is not the purpose of this paper to explore that particular side of the question. We can only call attention to it. In addition, however, it is not only possible but necessary to have a look once again at the way the Scriptures themselves speak of the humanity of Jesus Christ. At present we shall limit ourselves to the study of a rather crucial passage in Romans. It reads (8:3, 4):

For God has done what the Law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the just requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit. (RSV)

Now, obviously, this passage can be treated also under the subject of soteriology. That is not our aim, however, in the present discussion. We have set ourselves the

¹ Martin H. Scharlemann, "The Case for Four Adverbs: Reflections on Chalcedon," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXVIII, 12 (December 1957), 881—892.

task just now of interpreting what St. Paul says in this passage to throw light on the doctrine of the humanity of our Savior, Jesus Christ. For we must be sure that He was really a man. Our redemption depends on it. That is why the apostle needed to be most precise in the use of words. He had nothing less at hand than to set forth the very heart of the Incarnation in its redeeming consequences for mankind. To this end he had to avoid any kind of suggestion that the Incarnation was only a bit of holy pretense.

St. Paul's phraseology is designed, on the one hand, to reject the notion that the life of Jesus Christ as a man only seemed to be human, and on the other, to forestall any conception of Jesus as being no more than a man. The former error is known as docetism; the latter is called adoptionism. The apostle was determined to avoid encouraging either false view.

A look at verse three of the text under discussion will indicate that St. Paul thought of the incarnate Son as one who had been sent on a mission, on an assigned task. "God sent His own Son," we read. Nowhere else in the New Testament is the Son of God spoken of in just this way. There are other sons of God, of course, but only by adoption. There was and is only one person to whom the expression of "His own (*ἑαυτοῦ*) Son" could apply, and that is Jesus Christ. God's adopted sons are part of this cosmos, living within the circle of human existence. God's "own Son," however, was sent from beyond time and space on an assignment of redemption into our historical context with all of its limitations and vicissitudes.

St. Paul's words certainly imply that Jesus Christ "was at the beginning," to

appropriate a Johannine phrase. However, this is not the chief issue to which he addresses himself here. The immediate context speaks of liberation from the "law of sin and death." Now, the apostle is at pains to describe the way such freedom was effected.

The assurance of being free has, in point of fact, been the theme of the past few chapters in Romans. We are no longer under God's wrath; nor are we subject to sin, law, and death, now that the principle of the "Spirit of life in Jesus Christ" has been established. This radical change in man's situation, however, has not come about by means of the Law, even though, as a revelation from God, it was and is, in Paul's own words, holy, just, and good. For sin had captured God's holy Law and perverted its use by inciting men to rebellion against God rather than motivating them to obedience. The Law set forth the righteousness of God, to be sure, thereby accusing men of sin. But even so, it was unable to bring sin itself under condemnation. Instead, it evoked and increased sin. The Law had been given so that the righteousness of God might prevail. In place of that it put all things under God's wrath to a degree unknown beyond the sphere of this revelation of God's holy will. The Law turned out, in fact, to be part of the old aeon, unable to redeem man.

This being the situation, God resorted to the unbelievable measure of sending His very own Son, in fulfillment of His Word, to accomplish what the Law was unable to do. And so Christ Jesus came "in the matter of sin," we read. It was sin that had debased men by taking up residence as an alien power in our very flesh. It was the power of sin that had even twisted

God
ends
hypo
Sin
right
sion

T
have
of s
tuag
com
mea
tion
ther
or t
inter
guilt
ficial
of co
but
tion
sin a
to k
speci
It is
sion.

Je
sin"
lem
rebel
prov
It br
tion.
to en
ness
Pauli
one
sett
ceptu
Fo
mine
Son,

God's Law to make it serve destructive ends. Such an enemy—and Paul almost hypostasizes sin!—had to be dealt with. Sin had to be brought under condemnation right in its own realm. This was the mission on which God sent His own Son.

The *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* of the text, which we have translated as meaning "in the matter of sin," is the language used, in the Septuagint, of sin offerings. As a result some commentators suggest that the apostle meant to introduce the thought of expiation into our present passage. However, there is no indication in either the context or the text itself that Paul, at this point, intended to raise the whole issue of man's guilt. There is no hint here of any sacrificial language. That kind of terminology, of course, is found in many other passages, but here Paul devotes himself to the question of coming to grips with the power of sin at work in human life, to destroy and to kill. In other words, this text does not specifically discuss the death of our Lord. It is concerned rather with His total mission.

Jesus Christ was sent "in the matter of sin" to do something about the whole problem of man's estrangement from, and even rebellion against, God. The Law had proved to be impotent in this respect. It brought condemnation rather than liberation. Hence God sent His very own Son to enter the ranks of mankind "in the likeness of sinful flesh." Each term in this Pauline phrase is heavy with meaning. Not one syllable may be omitted without upsetting a very carefully constructed conceptual balance.

For one thing, the apostle was determined to say that Jesus Christ, God's own Son, was in every respect man, a partic-

ular individual, exposed to the full threat and force of sin. He is not content, therefore, to use just *σάρξ*; he adds the descriptive genitive *ἁμαρτίας*. The Son of God assumed not only flesh but "the likeness of sinful flesh," St. Paul insists.

"Flesh" itself is a strong term. It is used of man in his distinction from God. What is more, the Scriptures employ this word to speak of man in his alienation from God, as a being standing under God's judgment and condemnation. Into this estrangement came Christ Jesus and assumed "the likeness of sinful flesh." Lest there be any mistake about the measure of our Lord's descent, the apostle includes the word "sin" in his phrase to point out that it was not a perfect world into which God sent His Son as the second Adam. As such, in his redemptive activity, He entered the very center of our fallen estate. He was "born under the Law," St. Paul says in Galatians. Hebrews tells us that He was even made subject to death as He shared the nature of our flesh and blood.

This solidarity with us in our sinfulness Jesus assumed publicly at His Baptism. There He was officially designated to be God's Anointed, made sin for us in order, as St. Matthew puts it, to fulfill all righteousness. This means that God's Son did not enter the fabric of our mortal context in the form of a demigod or of an heroic ideal. His life was not spent above or even next to our own. His was no halfway commitment to our desperate state. Jesus Christ did not remain aloof from mankind. On the contrary, He even made it a point to associate with sinners and tax collectors, with people who stood outside the sacred order of things, according to the thinking of Israel's religious leaders. Jesus did so

in order to invade the very citadel of sin's inner fortress. This is precisely why so many passed Him by as a man. He could not be distinguished from others. Hence His own brothers are described by the evangelist John as not believing in Him.

It is hazardous, therefore, to set Jesus apart from men, except to make the point of Heb. 7:26 that He was without any sin of His own and so "separate from sinners." Ascribing to Jesus certain special qualities of physique and appearance² runs the risk of denying the redemptive power and purpose of our Lord's whole life. For if God's Son was to redeem us from our fallen estate, He had to be like us. If there is anything about our human nature that He did not assume at His incarnation, that part of us remains unhealed and unredeemed. For that reason, as Ignatius suggested many years ago, we ought to stop our ears if anyone would speak to us of a Christ not born of David and of Mary. He came as one who "truly (ἀληθῶς) assumed the body . . . truly ate and drank . . . was truly crucified—not just apparently (οὐ δοξίῃ) — and died."³ St. Augustine made a strong point of this when he said, "Non enim alterius naturae caro nostra et caro illius, nec alterius anima nostra et anima illius. Hanc suscepit naturam, quam salvandam esse indicavit."⁴ In this respect the Bishop

of Hippo followed Paul and the Greek fathers in their appreciation of the redemptive significance of our Lord's whole life.

St. Paul includes the term "likeness" (ὁμοίωμα) in his remark about "flesh of sin." Here we arrive at the very heart of Paul's attempt, under God's Spirit, to set forth in the language of his time the essence of the mystery of the Incarnation. He chose the Greek word ὁμοίωμα to carry the burden of his formulation. On the one hand, the apostle meant to point out that this "likeness" was not a matter of poetic fancy. This was no figure of speech, as might be suggested, for example, by the "as it were" of Philippi's commentary.⁵ For from the Biblical usage of ὁμοίωμα it is clear that this term signifies the concrete expression of similarity.⁶ That is to say, there was no make-believe in Jesus' becoming man. Moreover, this term stresses the fact that God's own Son truly became a human being. The "flesh" He assumed was no abstraction; it was that of one single individual, "being born in the likeness of men," as the apostle puts it in Phil. 2:7.

In other words, this term introduces a modification into Paul's phraseology for the purpose of recognizing the fact that Christ was Himself "without sin" and remained so (cf. Heb. 4:15). No one could ever accuse Him of having done a wrong. No unkind word ever left His lips; no guile was ever found in His words; no

⁵ I, 392.

² Artists in particular are known for wanting to depict Jesus as more than human. Sometimes theologians also draw inferences from Biblical texts that are difficult to justify. Thus Hollaz went so far as to say that Jesus refrained from laughter (*a risu abstinuit*). (*Examen theologicum acroamaticum*, p. III, sect. i, cap. iii, qu. 12, 4th ed. by John Henry Hollaz [Stockholm: Johannes Heinrich Russworm, 1725], II, 81—82).

³ *Ad Trallianos*, IX, 1, as given in Migne, *Patrologia*, v, 689.

⁴ *Sermo* 174, 2.2.

⁶ The important Biblical passages are the Septuagint of Deut. 4:16; Is. 40:19; and Ex. 20:4; as well as Rom. 6:5 and Phil. 2:7. On this term Kittel's *Theol. Wörterbuch* says (v, 191): "Es bezeichnet nicht abstrakt die Gleichheit oder Übereinstimmung, sondern stets das gleichgemachte Abbild"; and again: "Abbild, das einem anderen gleichgemacht ist und nun mit ihm übereinstimmt."

thou
He
did
Sinc
mak
In t
cilia
God
Rom
terio
cruc
part

W
liken
part
God
and
we
take
the
fury
from
the
pow
the
have
scen
and
quite
touch
us, f
sensi
how
macu
He r
next
man,
and
resid

7
quote
Perso

thoughts of hatred ever entered His soul. He Himself, though tempted as we are, did not have the experience of sinning. Since He lived where we do, God could make Him to be sin for us (2 Cor. 5:21). In this way God chose to effect a reconciliation between us and God, between God and us. For as the use of *ὁμοίωμα* in Rom. 6:5 reminds us, we are in some mysterious way identified with Jesus in His crucifixion and resurrection. This, too, is part of the paradox.

When God sent His own Son in "the likeness of sinful flesh," that Son became part of our situation as fallen creatures of God. That is to say, He was in every way, and to a much greater degree, tempted as we are. The synoptic gospels, therefore, take Jesus right from His Baptism into the desert, there to be exposed to the full fury of Satan's onslaught. Jesus was confronted with the prospect of living like the Son of God among men, using His power to escape the difficulties of life and the terrors of the crucifixion. He might have withdrawn from the necessity of descending to the full depth of our individual and particular existence. And we can be quite certain that the devil's assaults touched Him more deeply than they do us, for the very doing of sin has dulled our sensitivity to what is just and holy. Jesus, however, held out "like a fortress in immaculate purity by the Godhead within."⁷ He remained sinless, not because He lived next to life, but precisely because, as a true man, He fought off temptation by means and with the help of the Spirit of God residing in Him, creating what systematic

theology refers to as an *unio personalis*, wherein the powers and attributes of His divine nature were communicated to what St. John calls His "flesh."

The Lutheran Confessions by strong implication exempt Jesus from having been born in original sin by saying that all men born *in the natural way* are conceived and born in sin.⁸ This is their way of taking into account the Virgin Birth and its significance for the "likeness of sinful flesh." In several passages these same confessions attempt to clarify this mystery by drawing on the philosophic distinction between *accident* and *substance*. Sin is an accident, they say, not a substance, that is, it was not created by God. For the theological discussions of the 16th century this was, no doubt, a useful distinction to make. Whether this differentiation between that which is accidental and what is substantial is helpful today will depend, most likely, on the degree to which once accepts, or at least learns to work with, the presuppositions of the philosophical outlook that gave birth to this kind of terminology. The fact is that no kind of wording solves this riddle. The mystery inherent in Paul's formulation defies full explanation. It has always been and will continue to be God's secret. We can only try to talk about it as meaningfully as possible in a day that has become quite unfamiliar with Biblical terminology and, in addition, works with concepts and presuppositions very different from those that proved useful to the authors of our confessions.

When all is said and done, the descent of God the Son did not stop somewhere midway between heaven and earth. Christ

⁷ The words are those of Edward Irving as quoted in H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, 1931, p. 277.

⁸ The Augsburg Confession, Art. II.

Jesus came down all the way into our utmost estrangement in order to become a curse for us so that we might be set free. He Himself did no sin. Thereby He brought sin itself under full condemnation. This the Law had been unable to achieve. This was its weakness, for *ἀσχύς* had rendered God's own Law powerless to effect a liberation from the Egypt of our sin.

It should be noted that in our text the words *ἐν σαρκί* go with *κατέχουσιν*. The apostle's point is just this: right there where sin prevailed, God's Son brought sin under judgment by His perfect obedience. He did so by constantly refusing sin any entrance into His will and action. His meat was to do the Father's will, He said. And by this persevering and absolute exclusion of all that is sinful He brought sin itself under God's judgment, thereby destroying an alien power that had come to tyrannize over man's life.

The specific purpose God had in mind as He sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh is set forth in the text as follows: "In order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us. . . ." The Greek word for "requirement" is *δικαίωμα*. St. Paul had already used this term in 5:18 as a synonym for obedience and as meaning the very opposite of transgression. In the light of this usage we can be sure that it is Christ's active obedience, to borrow a word from dogmatics, which constitutes the Apostle's emphasis. By Himself living out the full demands of the Law, Jesus Christ met the requirements of God's holy will as revealed in that Law. In this way He became the second, or last Adam. Unlike the first one, Jesus did not want to be like God. In fact, He "emptied

Himself" in order to become an obedient servant. God sent Him on this mission in order to undo the effects of the disobedience in Eden.

Now the demands of God's Law on our individual lives have been fulfilled. Here, too, Jesus took our place. His whole life was lived vicariously. As a consequence, we have been set free from the Law. In fact, we live in the new aeon, or as St. Paul has it, "according to the Spirit." The purpose, then, of Christ's mission is not to be attained at some moment in the future, at the final *παρουσία*, for example. It has already been achieved. The life of Jesus Christ already sanctifies us, and the rule of Law has ended for us. Sin stands condemned by our Lord's refusal to yield to it. And in this way Jesus now stands at the head of a new humanity, one that has been liberated from "the law of sin and death," as St. Paul puts it. Now we need no longer walk according to flesh. We live in the new age.

The two aeons of revealed history, therefore, are separated from each other by an act of God's sending. Between them there stands one who came "in the likeness of sinful flesh" to settle this matter of sin once and for all by Himself living sinlessly among the most sinful of men and under all the pressures and tensions of man's creaturely existence. In this way He dislodged the power of sin over men, removing the very weapons of rebellion from our grasp. Apart from this we have no salvation. For this reason the Nicene Creed quite explicitly binds our redemption to the coming down of God's Son as incarnate and as man.

St. Louis, Mo.

T
C
in
pro
tas
in
the
"G
bli
yea
her
Th
40
to
the
v
Ge
wh
Tu
of
bro
Of
nals
Pich
2
eag
(Ph
Pres
Bib
1
leas
Ger
the
lect
H. I
Edit
the
The
no.
copi
was

The Geneva Bible

By CARL S. MEYER

ON April 10, 1560, the last page of an English Bible was taken off the press in Geneva. To say that it "rolled off the presses" would be an anachronism. The task of printing this Bible had been begun in January 1558. Twenty-seven months therefore were required for its printing—"God knoweth with what fear and trembling we have been for the space of two years and more, day and night, occupied herein," its translator-pressmen testify.¹ This was the famed Geneva Bible, now 400 years old, which only slowly gave way to the King James Version (1611) during the 17th century.²

Why was it published in Geneva? Geneva was the home of English refugees who had left England at the onset of Mary Tudor's reign (1553). They were fearful of the religious changes that would be brought about—and well they might be. Of Puritanical bent, they had little love for

the "Old Religion," which Mary espoused. They could not foresee the extent of the persecutions under Mary; they believed they were imminent and, with those who settled in Frankfort and elsewhere, they fled betimes.³ After the death of Mary (Nov. 18, 1558) the refugees quickly returned to England.

In the meanwhile, however, as noted, the printing of the complete Bible was well under way. The activity could not be transferred to London, since no printer had as yet been licensed to print Bibles and New Testaments.⁴ Eager as they might be to return to England, the translator-printers had to remain in Geneva to complete their task.

William Whittingham, Anthony Gilby, and Thomas Sampson were the chief, perhaps the only, men responsible for the new translation. Their names are not given in the preface, but there is general agreement among investigators in ascribing the new

¹ Quoted by Christopher Anderson, *The Annals of the English Bible* (London: William Pickering, 1845), II, 319.

² Charles C. Butterworth, *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340—1611* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941), p. 163, calls it "the household Bible of the English people" for 50 years.

Between 1560 and 1644 there were at least 140 editions of the Geneva Bible or the Geneva New Testament. Fifty-seven years ago the British and Foreign Bible Society had collected 120 of these editions. T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of the Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (London: The Bible House, 1903), I (English), 61, 62, no. 77. Copy 364 of this work, printed in 500 copies, now in the Concordia Seminary library, was used in preparing this article.

³ C. H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles* (Cambridge, 1938); H. J. Cowell, "The Sixteenth Century English Speaking Refugee Churches at Geneva and Frankfurt," *Huguenot Society Proceedings*, XVI (1939), 209—230; W. M. Southgate, "The Marian Exiles and the Influence of John Calvin," *History*, XXVII (1942), 148 to 152.

⁴ On Jan. 8, 1561, Elizabeth granted a license to John Bodley to print the Geneva Bible. See "Privilege and Licence to John Bodley for Printing the Geneva Bible for Seven Years" printed from the original Patent Roll, 3 Elizabeth, Part 13 (34), 1. A. F. Pollard, *Records of the English Bible: The Documents relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525—1611* (London: Oxford University Press, 1911), pp. 284 f, no. XLVIII.

version to these three men.⁵ They had collaborators, even as they used previous English versions of the Scriptures. Among these advisers were Goodman and Cox, Coverdale and Knox, Calvin and Beza.

Oxford-educated William Whittingham (1525?—79), minister of the English congregation in Geneva, brother-in-law of John Calvin—he married Calvin's wife's sister—had issued an English version of the New Testament in 1557. It was a period of new versions, and Geneva was a center of Bible publication. Here in the previous year Theodore Beza had brought out a new Latin translation of the Greek New Testament.⁶ Not in Geneva, but in London, Richard Jugge had printed a revision of Tyndale's New Testament in 1552 and 1553, which Whittington used for his 1557 version.⁷ Beza, Jugge, Tyn-

dale, Coverdale, and perhaps others contributed, each in his way, to this New Testament of 1557, which was revised for the Geneva Bible of 1560. Nevertheless Butterworth's tribute is in order:

No one can handle this small, compact, careful, and courageous edition without a feeling of respect for the work and for its chief producer, Whittingham. . . .⁸

The full title of this edition is *The / Newve Testa- / ment of our Lord Ie- / sus Christ. / Conferred diligently with the Greke, and best ap- / proued translations. / VVith the arguments, as wel before the chapters, as for euery Boke / & Epistle, also diuersities of readings, and moste profitable / annotations of all harde places: whereunto is added a copi- / ous Table. / At Geneva / Printed by Conrad Badius. / M. D. LVII.* Truth and time are depicted on the title page with an inscription: "God by Tyme restoreth Trvth / and maketh her victoriouvs" — the hope of the English exiles.

Calvin added an "Epistle" as an introduction to the version; the translator addressed a preface to the reader. Whittingham also added annotations to his New Testament of 1557, with "arguments" placed before each of these books, original in scope, and not dependent primarily on Jerome or Erasmus. Critical notes and explanations, almost a commentary, were

(no. 72), a quarto edition of the same (no. 73), Jugge's revision, a second quarto edition, in 1553 (no. 74), and a 1553 octavo edition of the New Testament in 1553 (no. 75).

⁸ Butterworth, pp. 162 f.

Darlow and Moule, p. 60, no. 76, say: "The text is based upon Tindale's, compared with the Great Bible, and largely influenced by Beza's Latin translation."

⁵ Butterworth, p. 145; Anderson, II, 320 to 322; Brooke F. Westcott, *A General View of the History of the English Bible*, third edition, revised by Wm. A. Wright (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1905), pp. 90—92.

Pope lists Whittingham, Christopher Goodman, Thomas Sampson, and Richard Cox (whom he calls a Lutheran) as the translators. Hugh Pope, *English Versions of the Bible*, revised and amplified by Sebastian Bullough (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1952), pp. 216—219.

Darlow and Moule, p. 61, say rather cautiously that it was translated by Whittingham, Sampson, and Gilby, "and perhaps others."

⁶ A copy of the 1565 edition, autographed by Beza as a gift for Henry Bullinger in Zurich, is in the Concordia Seminary library. This 1565 edition contained the Greek text (it is the first edition of Beza's Greek text) and Beza's Latin version. Edgar Krentz, "Autograph Beza New Testament," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXX (January 1959), 64, 65.

⁷ Butterworth, p. 150. Darlow and Moule, pp. 56—59, list the 1552 (4°) edition (no. 69), a second edition (16°) in 1552 (no. 70), the 1553 (4°) edition of the whole Bible (no. 71), a folio edition of the Great Bible in 1553

add
men
won
ital
into
in t
edit
the

I
guis
Wo
lam
won
thei
tion
acco
revi
ferr
also
He
a re
Tyn
the
fere
the

T
but
rem
"
wer
wer
T
pub

9
Polla
10
illus
pp. 2
ary I
whic
Wyc
W

added. It was the first English New Testament printed in Roman type, with the words not in the Greek original marked in italics and with the division of the chapters into verses. These features were retained in the 1560 Geneva Bible and subsequent editions, contributing to the popularity of the work.

In his preface Whittingham distinguished among malicious despisers of the Word, the indifferent, and the "simple lambs," to whom he is addressing his words. They are of Christ's flock and know their Father's will, he said; they "are affectioned to the trueth." To them he gave an account of his method of translation and revision, the method which, it may be inferred, he and his collaborators followed also in drawing up the 1560 Geneva Bible. He acknowledged that his translation is a revision [he does not add, however, of Tyndale's translation], which was made on the basis of the Greek text and a "conference of translations in other tonges as the learned may easily iudge."⁹

There were changes in the 1560 edition, but the Whittingham revision of Tyndale remained the basis of the Geneva Bible; ". . . the changes introduced in 1560 were not in any way startling, yet they were considerable."¹⁰

The year before the entire Bible was published a separate translation of the

Psalter was printed. This version presumably is the same as that which appeared in the Geneva Bible of 1560. The Psalter as well as all the remainder of the Old Testament in the 1560 edition is a revision of the Great Bible (1539). The translations of Pagninus, Leo Juda, and Sebastian Münster, and the revision of Pierre Olive-tan's French version, made in Geneva in 1555 under the direct supervision and with the help of John Calvin in Geneva, were utilized.¹¹ The Apocrypha, incidentally, were included in the Geneva Bible.

The printer under whose supervision and auspices the Geneva Bible appeared was Rowland Hall. The cost of publishing the work seems to have been borne chiefly by John Bodley—the same individual to whom Queen Elizabeth issued the sole license to print the Bible for seven years on Jan. 8, 1561, although other English Puritans in Geneva also contributed.

The title page of the Geneva Bible reads: *The Bible / and Holy Scriptures / con-
teyned in / the Olde and Newe Testament.
/ Translated accord- / ding to the Ebrue
and Greke, and conferred With / the best
translations in diuers languages. / With
moste profitable annota- / tions vpon al
the hard places, and other things of great
/ importance as may appeare in the Epistle
to the Reader. / At Geneva. / Printed by
Rouland Hall. / M. D. LX.*

The first edition of this Bible, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth I, was illustrated with 26 "figures" in the text, to elucidate, as the Preface states, "certeyne places in the bookes of Moses, of the Kings and Ezekiel." These "seemed so darke that by no descrip-

⁹ "Preface to the Geneva New Testament," Pollard, p. 276, no. XLVI.

¹⁰ Butterworth, p. 169; see p. 170 for an illustration from 1 Cor. 13:9-12. Appendix I, pp. 245-253 has 10 passages ("Selected Literary Passages Arranged for Comparative Study") which are reproduced in nine readings from Wycliffe to King James.

Westcott, pp. 223-225.

¹¹ Butterworth, pp. 165, 166; Pope, p. 230; Westcott, pp. 212, 213.

tion thei colde be made easie to the simple reader." The translation added figures and notes as explanations to visualize the text, so that "by the perspecutiue, and as it were by the eye [the reader] may sufficiently knowe the true meaning of all suche places." Five maps are in this Bible, or as the preface calls them, "mappes of Cosmographie which necessarily serue for the perfect vnderstanding and memorie of diuers places and countreys, partly described, and partly by the occasion touched, bothe in the olde and new Testament."¹² The maps illustrate the wanderings of the Israelites, the division of Canaan, Jerusalem and the second temple, Palestine in the time of Christ, and the journeys of the apostles. On the title page is a small woodcut of the passage through the Red Sea by the Israelites. Around the woodcut are the texts: "Feare ye not, stand stil, and beholde the saluation of the Lord

which he wil shewe to you this day. The Lord shall fight for you: therefore holde you your peace" (Ex. 14:13, 14); and, "Great are the troubles of the righteous: But the Lord deliuereth them out of all" (Psalm 34:19).¹³ Two tables are found in the book, a glossary of Hebrew names and, in effect, a concordance. These two tables, the reader is informed, have been added, "that nothing might lacke which might be nought by labors, for the increase of Gods glorie."¹⁴

To illustrate the style of the Geneva Bible translation two passages are given below. The first line (labeled 1560) is the Geneva Bible translation, the second is Tyndale-Coverdale translation (labeled 1534),¹⁵ the third is the King James Version (labeled 1611), and the fourth is the Revised Standard Version (labeled 1946 or 1952). Ps. 46:1-3:

- 1560 God is our hope and strength, and helpe in troubles, ready to be found.
 1534 God is our hope and strength: a very present help in trouble
 1611 God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble
 1952 God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble
- 1560 Therefore will not we feare, though the earth be moued,
 1534 Therefore we will not fear, though the earth be moved:
 1611 Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed,
 1952 Therefore we will not fear though the earth should change
- 1560 and though the mountaines fall into the midst of the sea.
 1534 and though the hills be carried into the midst of the sea.

¹² "Preface to the Geneva Bible," Pollard, ed., pp. 282, 283, no. XLVII.

¹³ From the copy in the British Museum, London. See Dalow and Moule, p. 61, no. 77.

¹⁴ "Preface to the Geneva Bible," Pollard, ed., p. 283, no. XLVII.

¹⁵ The translation is cited from the 1607 edition, printed in London by Robert Bakker,

of which a copy is in the Concordia Seminary library.

Tyndale's New Testament version is cited from the reprint edited by N. Hardy Wallis, *The New Testament Translated by William Tyndale 1534* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1938); and the Old Testament section from *The Psalms of David*, Coverdale's Version, edited by George Raylands (London: Faber J. Gwyer, 1926).

- 1611 and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea;
 1952 though the mountains shake in the heart of the sea;
 1560 Though the waters thereof rage and be troubled: and the mountains shake
 at the surges of the same.
 1554 Though the waters thereof rage and swell: and the mountains shake at the
 tempest of the same.
 1611 though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake
 with the swelling thereof.
 1952 though the waters roar and foam, though the mountains tremble with its
 tumult.

The second example comes from the New Testament (Gal. 2:16).

- 1560 Knowe that a man is not iustified by the workes of the Lawe,
 1534 Knowe that a man is not iustified by the dedes of the lowe:
 1611 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law,
 1946 who know that a man is not justified by works of the law
 1560 but by the faith of Iesus Christ: euen wee I say, haue
 1534 but by the fayth of Iesus Christ. And therefore we have
 1611 but by the faith of Iesus Christ, even we have
 1946 but through faith in Iesus Christ, even we have
 1560 beleueed in Iesus Christ, that wee might be iustified
 1534 beleved on Iesus Christ, that we myght be iustified
 1611 believed in Iesus Christ, that we might be justified
 1946 believed in Christ Iesus, in order to be justified
 1560 by the faith of Christ, and not by the workes of the Lawe,
 1534 by the fayth of Christ, and not by the dedes of the lawe:
 1611 by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law:
 1946 by faith in Christ, and not by works of the law,
 1560 because that by the workes of the Law, no flesh shall be justified.
 1534 because that by the dedes of the lawe, no fleshe shalbe justified.
 1611 for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.
 1946 because by the works of the law shall no one be justified.

The "argument," as it is called by the translators, prefacing, e.g., the Epistle to the Romans, reflects their Calvinistic theology. It is intended to provide a very succinct summary of the letter.

The great mercie of God is declared toward man in Christ Iesus, whose righteousness is made ours through faith. For when man by reason of his owne corruption could not fulfill the law, yea, continued most abhom-

inably, both against the law of God, and nature the infinite bountie of God, mindful of his promise made to his servant Abraham, the father of all beleueers, ordained that mans saluation should onely stand in the perfitt obedience of his Sonne Iesus Christ: so that not only the circumcised Iewes, but also the vncircumcised Gentiles should be saved by faith in him: euen as Abraham before he was circumcised, was counted iust onely through faith, and yet afterward receiued circumcision as a seale or badge of the same righteousness by faith. And to the intent that none should thinke that the couenant which God made to him and his posteritie, was not performed: either because the Iewes receiued not Christ (which was the blessed seed) or else beleueed not he was the true redeemer, because he did not onely, or at least more notably preserue the Iewes: the examples of Ismael and Esau declare that all are not Abraham's posteritie, which come of Abraham according to the flesh: but also the very strangers and Gentiles grafted in by faith, are made heires of the promise. The cause whereof is the only will of God: forasmuch as of his free mercy he electeth some to bee saued, and of his iust iudgement he reiecteth others to be damned, as appeareth by the testimonies of the Scriptures. Yet to the intent that the Iewes should not bee too much beaten downe, nor the Gentiles too much puffed vp, the example of Elias proueth, that God hath yet his elect euen of the naturall posteritie of Abraham, though it appeareth not so to mans eye: and for that preferment that the Gentiles haue, it proceedeth of the liberall mercy of God, which hee at length will stretch toward the Iewes againe, and so gather the whole Israel (which is his Church) of them both. This groundworke of faith & doctrine laied, instructions of Christian maners folow:

teaching euery man to walke in roundnesse of conscience in his vocation, with all patience and humblenesse, reuerencing and obeying the Magistrate, exercising charities, putting off the old man, and putting on Christ, bearing the weake, and louing one another according to Christs example. Finally, Saint Paul after his commendations to the brethren, exhorteth them to vnitie, and to flee false preachers and flatterers, and so concludeth with a prayer.

Various noteworthy features of this introduction must be passed over. The anti-Roman sentiments of Whittingham are present only by inference. In other passages, however, he (and his collaborators with him) demonstrate their strong animosity to the Roman Church. The annotations of the Book of Revelation have frequent references to the Antichrist, by whom the Roman Bishop is meant. By way of illustration one example is cited. On Rev. 9:6 they give the exegesis that "the Popes clergie shall be proud, ambitious, bolde stout, rash, rebellious, stubborn, cruell, lecherous, and authors of warre and destruction of the simple children of God."

The Geneva Bible, because of such annotations, for one thing, would draw the fire of the Romanists. In 1582 Gregory Martin of the English College at Rheims wrote a *Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretikes of our daies, specially the English Sectaries, and of their foule dealing herein, by partial & false translations to the aduantage of their heresies, in their English Bible used and authorised since the time of Schisme.*

Martin's attack was answered by Wil-

lia
an
ius
ma
pu

cus
mi
Bi
to
Ge
bro
by
mo
ges
the
Ma
gn

tra
sup
ins
1:1
ins
has
at
du
by

Fog
I
pri
Geo
I
pri
Parl
hor
bel
r
gest
men

liam Fulke in his *A Defense of the sincere and true Translations of the holie Scriptures into the English tong, against the manifolde cauils, friulous quarels, and impudent slaunders of Gregrie Martin*, etc.¹⁶

In his *Defense* Fulke answered the accusation of Martin that the Geneva Bible mistranslates by denying that the Geneva Bible translates Beza "whom they profess to translate." He maintained that the Geneva Bible follows the Greek and Hebrew texts and not the Latin translation by Beza.¹⁷ Martin nicknamed Beza "the mouse of Geneva," because Beza had suggested emendations to three passages in the New Testament. This, according to Martin, showed that Beza "nibbleth and gnaweth about" the original text.¹⁸

Martin claimed that the Geneva Bible translated many passages falsely in order to support the Protestant teachings. So, for instance, he said that δικαιώματα in Luke 1:16 should be translated "justifications" instead of "ordinances" as the Geneva Bible has it. The annotation of the Geneva Bible at this point reads: "The Greeke word δικαιώματα signifieth iustifications, where-by is meant the outward obseruation of the

ceremonies commanded by God."¹⁹ The translation of τοῦ θανάτου (θάνατος) in Acts 2:24 is a point of controversy. Here the Geneva Bible has "grave," although Wycliffe, Tyndale, and Cranmer (the Great Bible) have "hell."²⁰ But Beza is the target whom Martin would reach. He called him "their [the English Calvinists] chief translator, and a captain among them, whom they profess to follow in the title of the New Testament, anno 1580, and by the very name of their Geneva Bibles. . . ." To this Fulke answered:

That we profess to follow Beza by the very name of our Geneva Bibles, it is a very ridiculous argument: for our Bibles are so commonly called, because they were translated and first printed at Geneva, not by Beza (who at that time had scarce finished his translation of the New Testament, and never dealt with translating of the old, so far as we know) but by certain godly and learned Englishmen, which lived there in queen Mary's time, to enjoy the liberty of a good conscience, which they could not have in their own country.²¹

Learned they were, and their translation reflects their scholarship. The translation of Gen. 3:7 with "breeches" ("and the Lord made them breeches," KJV: "aprons") has given the Geneva Bible a nickname which connotes unfortunate renditions. The Geneva Bible, however, as Butterworth and others point out, is a scholarly translation and is important in the lineage of the King James Bible.

St. Louis

¹⁶ Martin's work was published by Iohn Fogny of Rheims.

Fulke's work appeared in 1583; it was printed in London by Henry Bynneman for George Bishop.

In 1843 the Cambridge University Press printed a modern edition of the text for the Parker Society, edited by Charles Henry Hartshorne. This Parker Society edition is cited below.

¹⁷ Fulke, pp. 117, 118.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 41. These emendations were suggested in Beza's *Annotations on the New Testament* of 1556.

¹⁹ Fulke, pp. 118, 119.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 128.

²¹ Ibid., p. 154.

Casework Therapy and the Clergy

By ROBERT DEVRIES¹

IN addition to the usual social work services, the social service department of our agency makes available to clergymen casework therapy for parishioners who present problems which seemingly do not respond to pastoral counseling. Helping many people with varied problems during the last four years, therapy has here demonstrated its usefulness as an adjunct to pastoral counseling.

A number of clergymen have shown interest in gaining a better understanding of the casework therapy process. An equal number have indicated some uneasiness in their relationship with social workers who practice casework therapy.

To clarify the role which therapy may legitimately play in the church three issues must be considered. An attempt will, therefore, be made: (1) to define casework therapy; (2) to discuss why, in some cases, theologians have good reason to be uneasy while working with some social workers; and (3) to develop some rules to help pastors (who may wish to refer a patient for therapy) determine which social workers should be avoided.

I

Perhaps we can best define casework therapy by starting with a description of the dynamics of emotional disturbance. A person is faced with a problem which usually involves some conflict with his environment and the strong emotions of

fear, hatred, anger, jealousy, etc., and which becomes too painful to live with. He, therefore, is forced to get rid of it, to deny it exists, to bury it. In other words, through the use of some mental mechanism it is "forgotten." But the fact that it is no longer "remembered" does not mean the buried and painful problem no longer exists. It remains and will produce some kind of symptomatic thoughts and behavior which express them. If these thoughts and behavior adversely affect the person or the community, the person will need special help to understand the cause of his present behavior and to face his real problem. Therapists know that, since the individual escaped unbearable pain by covering up his problem in the first place, he cannot do this alone. In fact, he will *resist* facing the painful thought or experience. To help the person overcome this resistance and face his real problem is the therapist's aim and responsibility. By this process the individual will, hopefully, master the problem or learn to live with it in a socially acceptable manner.

The story of the fox who longed for grapes contains one of the simplest examples of the way in which a person by the use of one of the mental mechanisms can fool himself by covering up an unbearable experience. Unable to reach the grapes, the fox denied his desire for them by asserting that he really didn't like grapes. If the "fox" can nevertheless lead a productive and useful life, his rationalization in itself is not a sign of emotional disturbance.

¹ Clinical Director of Home for Aged Lutherans, Wauwatosa, Wis.

Of course, by continually reassuring himself and his friends about his dislike for grapes he may bore them to tears. However, if the jolt his vanity received when he was unable to reach the grapes, or if his frustration prompts him to kick his baby brother or steal cars or have babies out of wedlock, he will be in need of special help. His delinquent and otherwise troublesome behavior is a symptom of his real problem. Should a therapist work merely with these symptoms, the individual may give up stealing and fighting only to turn to fire-setting. "Success" with symptoms is much like the success one gains by plugging up the surface hole of a lawn mole. He merely digs another some distance away.

Symptoms are here understood as that expressed behavior which results when a painful experience is excluded from consciousness.

Symptomatic behavior is not necessarily detrimental. Many people with serious mental illness may be better off living with their symptoms. Most "normal" people exhibit symptoms which, when they do not interfere with ordinary activity, need concern no one. However, "healthy" people whose symptoms cripple their lives so that their behavior becomes detrimental to society, need help.

Different schools of psychology do not agree on the manner in which people "forget" painful thoughts and experiences nor on the way in which symptoms develop. However, they do agree that this process, called repression, does occur. The process has been described in this way:

The conflict is shut off from normal access to the conscious and is preserved with its emotional content in the uncon-

scious; it is forgotten, "it is disassociated" from the essential consciousness, without at the same time being destroyed and made to cease its underground activity.²

But the fact of repression obviously seems to be easily verifiable in anyone's general experience. Practically, it may be taken for granted that all of us have in some measure become acquainted with repression, perhaps in its coarser forms: I mean we have given some evidence of "repression" of the claims of certain innate powers, which have never been completely satisfied on the one hand, or completely rejected on the other, the implication being that these powers have never been remolded into a more precious metal but remain in the secret recesses in all their crudeness. In our dealing with people we have, perchance, had the experience at times when it seemed as if a subterranean world opens up in their inner being; a world which gives one the impression that it is kept secret not only from others but also from the person himself. It may be a closed-in bitterness, some jealousy, or a desire for revenge which escapes in an unguarded moment; or some basic innate characteristic gushing forth, betraying deepfelt grievance and repressed depravity. Not a word need be expressed; it may very well be simply a gesture or a look by a person in an unguarded moment, who himself at the time feels free from observation and for this reason can afford to ease up on the strenuous watchfulness which he, often unconsciously, must maintain over his own vital, robust, sensual but repressed drives of one kind or another. That such a postponed and probably half-forgotten arrangement between the moral ego and nagging wishes and drives of another kind can make

² Arvid Runestam, *Psychoanalysis and Christianity* (Rock Island: Augustana Press, 1958), p. 31.

a person nervous and insecure in the course of his life is sufficiently exemplified. [pp. 40, 41]

In the excellent book, *What, Then, Is Man?*, a definition and list of the more common mental mechanisms are presented, of which repression is one. Mental mechanisms are described as

certain processes of thought in which everyone indulges, but one needs to be able to recognize an exaggeration which is causing trouble or may be the symptom of a severe emotional illness or psychosis.

Mental mechanisms are those methods by which persons strive to protect the personality, satisfy its emotional needs, solve conflicting tendencies, maintain the self-image, and alleviate anxiety. They help to preserve self-esteem by an unconscious denial of unacceptable thoughts or tendencies. They are not indulged in deliberately but are unconscious reactions to certain situations.³

Listed are the commonest types: repression, sublimation, rationalization, compensation, symbolization, displacement, projection, identification, escape, reaction formation, and conversion.

Examples may help to clarify the process. An elderly lady living in a home for the aged complains she is unhappy because she hates the food the home serves and is starving to death. An analysis of its food service indicates her complaint is not valid. She does not recognize her real problem. However, in therapy she eventually can discuss anger at the son who made her leave her home. With continued therapy she finally understands that she cannot live alone. Now, her group home becomes her "real" home. She no longer

needs to use her supposed dislike of its food as a means to cover up her anger against her son. After she faced and resolved this anger, she experienced better mental health.

Another woman complains that she must divorce her husband because he no longer loves her. Though she appreciates that he is a good breadwinner and loves his four children, she finds something obnoxious about him and, because "we are not matched," she believes divorce to be the only solution to her problem. In the course of therapy, she states, "He's just like my father." Obviously, no marriage can succeed if a woman identifies her husband with her father. With some help this woman expressed her emotional problem, which centered in her father, and which she had never resolved as a little girl. After enough of this conflict was resolved, she had less need to fight her husband (the angry little girl against her cruel father), and she was able to use her energy more profitably in being a wife to her husband.

These two cases offer evidence that if people who are engaging in symptomatic behavior are to regain their mental health, they must be helped to recognize the "lie" in their lives. Through the use of a relationship fostered by special professional techniques, learned in graduate school, a properly trained professional social worker recognizes symptomatic behavior, and through the casework therapy process helps the individual: (1) to recognize this "lie" as a symptom or cover-up for his real problem, and (2) to give up this symptom and come to grips with his real problem.

Any healthy person can learn these techniques in accredited schools of social work. Professional competence, however, requires,

³ *What, Then, Is Man?* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958), p. 142.

in addition to these two or three years of academic training, 1,300 to 2,000 hours of actual experience in an accredited agency together with several additional years of supervised experience.

It seems safe, therefore, to conclude that people suffer from mental and emotional problems which often can be treated with some degree of success only by people with professional training and experience. Properly practiced, social work and psychiatry can, therefore, be useful adjuncts in caring for the souls of individuals.

II

If this is true, why have parish pastors and theologians become uneasy when working with some social workers who practice therapy?

Three cases will illustrate the reason for their uneasiness.

Case 1 — A well-to-do middle-aged couple with three half-grown children decides that severe family stresses have made a divorce unavoidable. Communicants of a Lutheran congregation and contributing 10% of their income to church purposes, the father holds a responsible job, and the mother actively serves both her church and her community. A secular psychiatrist (with no belief in God, as he publicly states) discusses with this couple their verbalized and real inadequacies. Talking over their incompatibilities with him, they gain some self-knowledge. The three also discuss the probability of divorce and the possibility that the couple may stay together.

After coming face to face with their problems, this couple decides that a continuance of their marriage is not possible.

Because he knows that these people took

a spiritual vow before God to remain together for better or for worse and that their three children must also be seriously considered, their pastor becomes upset by this general plan.

The minister faces a dilemma: he cannot accept the "evil" solution under discussion by the psychiatrist and this couple, but he also knows that in spite of his own efforts this Christian family seems to be sinking into hopeless despair.

Equally disturbing is his feeling that this husband and wife are more comfortable with their psychiatrist, who states he is not putting them under moral stress during therapy, than they are with the pastor.

Case 2 — An unmarried mother seeks help from her minister. Sympathetically he counsels her that she has done an evil thing and encourages her to ask forgiveness.

This counsel upsets the girl, who finds more solace, she thinks, at a secular agency. In a conversation sometime later the social worker indicates to her pastor that this girl had been in conflict with her mother and through casework therapy had been helped to resolve this conflict. To accomplish this, the social worker indicated that during casework therapy no moral stress had been put on this unmarried mother.

When the clergyman asked why the girl did not want to return to discuss her trouble with him, the social worker also intimated that the girl felt more comfortable with her than with the minister because by not exerting moral pressure she was more loving and understanding. The minister said he felt the social worker was too easy on the girl.

The social worker recommended that the girl continue to experience with her pastor

and parents the same lack of moral pressure which had been successful during casework therapy. She warned the minister that if he made a moral issue of the fact that this girl is an unmarried mother, she might become upset and not want to see him. She also counseled that the unmarried mother should not be subjected to the high moral standards under which she lived before getting into trouble.

Case 3—A 16-year-old boy goes to court for car theft. After several casework interviews in which no moral pressure was placed on the boy, his probation officer, in the presence of the boy and his parents, recommends that the parents relax their moral demands on this boy and do not insist on church and Bible class attendance. He expresses this idea in such a way that the boy later tells his parents and minister, "Only my probation officer understands me."

It is evident from these three case histories, to which we shall return later, that the psychiatrist, social worker, and probation officer did not put moral pressure on these people during therapy.

Because they felt that these professional people might destroy or tend to lower the moral standards of their parishioners, the clergymen involved in these cases, however, were critical.

Typical of many other clergymen, they gained an impression that social workers and the "bag of tricks" used in casework therapy must be essentially evil because these techniques seem to "stand for nothing." A careful analysis must be made to try to understand why this impression has come about. An event which took place at a regional conference for social workers and clergymen may offer a clue. There

a social worker quite frankly stated that a large church had engaged him as a group worker, since his professional training had taught him "to love people more than a person who had not benefited from social work training." Challenged, he finally admitted that through training he had learned to be "less judgmental" and "more accepting." When a minister probed to determine in what way the social worker was more accepting and less judgmental, the latter cited as example his ability to accept the immoral behavior of an unmarried mother without putting any moral pressure on her. The ministers took exception to his conclusion that this made him more "loving" than an individual who constructively criticized this girl for her behavior. The question quite naturally followed, "Who displays greater love—the pastor who helps the unmarried mother live up to moral standards or the social worker who relaxes all moral demands while helping her to try to understand why she needed to have a baby out of wedlock."

The fact that the social worker, who appeared to be preaching a way of life devoid of moral standards, could not clarify his position seemed to indicate to the clergymen an unhappy and significant confusion about fundamentals in the mind of the social worker. In turn the social worker was subtly or unknowingly indicating that because the clergy stand for a way of life which makes moral demands of people he was "more loving" than they. The ministers present had little doubt that the social worker's seemingly amoral philosophy stemmed from his professional training in secular social work.

Obviously an examination of this secular training seems in order. As a part of his

professional training the social worker learned that successfully to carry out the casework and group work therapy process certain principles are important. Father F. P. Beistek of Loyola University School of Chicago has stated seven principles, generally accepted by the social work profession, as basic tools to effect the therapeutic process. They are necessary to help maintain the proper relationship between the therapist and his client, as he helps the client with his resistance to discussing his "buried problem." They are acceptance, permissiveness, controlled emotional involvement, individualization, nonjudgmental attitude, client self-determination, and confidentiality.

A brief description of each would include the following: *Acceptance* — The therapist accepts a person's problem no matter what it is. *Permissiveness* — Without reservation the therapist allows a client to think about his problem in any manner he chooses. *Controlled emotional involvement* — The therapist does not personally respond to the problem with anger, tears, disinterest, or disgust. *Individualization* — The therapist sees each person's problem as the unique experience of a unique person. *Nonjudgmental attitude* — The therapist possesses the emotional ability to discuss his client's problem without judging him or his actions. *Client self-determination* — The therapist recognizes his client's inalienable right finally to dispose of his problem without direction from the therapist (except in instances in which the client may jeopardize his own or the life of others). *Confidentiality* — The therapist keeps confidential information gained during therapy.

Helping to maintain morals as a part of

his lifework and his deepest convictions, the clergyman naturally grows uneasy at the apparent lack of moral principle on the part of the casework therapist using these seven principles. He believes that, if mankind is going to live within some kind of moral structure, all men must judge immoral behavior. Should the permissive attitude of the therapist pervade life, mankind, the clergyman feels, would be involved in a full moral breakdown. When the therapist talks about his own controlled emotional involvement during therapy sessions, the clergyman asks warily, "Can we have any moral standards at all if people do not tell others how they stand on moral issues? Certainly no intelligent person can develop a philosophy demanding no moral judgments and make it his way of life!" He continues, "These apparently immoral principles may be all right in their place, but do we know where that place is?" The properly trained, experienced caseworkers can put these principles in their rightful place. Let us see how.

Covering up an experience because it is painful, the client will resist returning to face his pain. Since he has found a way to "kid himself," the client cannot be objective, and this is the core of his difficulty. At this point the therapist's objectivity must be taken for granted. The therapist aims to help his client overcome this resistance and gain the ability objectively to view his problem. A "battle" ensues. *But this battle is not between what the therapist stands for and what the client stands for. The therapist dare not let the client battle him personally.* The battle must focus on the client's resistance to facing up to his real problem. To keep the client from making this a personal struggle between

himself and the therapist, a special relationship must be maintained. This relationship, effective because the therapist employs the seven basic principles of therapy, enables the client and his therapist to focus their attention on the client's resistance. If the therapist destroys this relationship by violating one of these seven principles for any reason whatsoever, a personal struggle between the therapist and his client will ensue. Both will lose their objectivity and be unable usefully to discuss the critical resistance. The case is lost.

Once the client faces his real pain, the therapeutic process is no longer of any use to the client. Now an individual, probably crying because of his real "hurt," confronts the therapist. If agency policy or personal conviction prevent him from giving the client the additional help he still needs, he must refer his client to someone else. The therapeutic process has served its whole purpose.

The therapist no longer cares about remaining identified with or helping the patient overcome his resistance. With resistance eliminated, the special relationship used in the therapeutic process no longer needs to be safeguarded. In fact, as soon as the client sees the problem, the special relationship must be discarded.

Like the gardener, who uses a hoe to destroy weeds, or the surgeon, who uses a knife to remove a cancer, so the competent therapist uses the tools of his trade to combat emotional and mental illness. The gardener puts his hoe away at the end of the day. The surgeon places his knife in the sterilizer after an operation. When he has helped the client to overcome his resistance to unpleasant and painful experiences, the therapist lays aside his seven

professional tools, which made the therapy process possible.

It is obvious then that just as the hoe and the knife are neither moral nor immoral, so also the therapeutic process is neither moral nor immoral. Therapy, properly handled, does not preach anything.

Equally important are the following observations: because a casework therapist (making rightful use of his tools) for treatment purposes does not exert moral pressure, it does not follow that he wishes to lower or otherwise alter the moral standards of his patient. Nor is he himself necessarily without moral standards. Nor does he necessarily condone his client's immoral life.

A careful review of the three cases presented in the first part of the article indicates that in the first the psychiatrist properly used his tools. The psychiatrist did not preach a way of life. Not he, but the couple itself had to make the decision as to whether or not to seek a divorce and break the Moral Law. The negative qualities of their marital relationship had now been exposed and made known to them and could be made available by the couple to their minister. The psychiatrist did not determine the manner in which the couple finally chose to deal with their guilt.

Case 2, however, clearly reveals why the clergyman, who dealt with it, became uneasy and concerned. In this instance the social worker made good use of her therapy tools to help her client recognize that she had a baby out of wedlock because of her poor relationship with her mother. To help her client overcome her resistance the social worker was properly permissive, non-judgmental, etc. However, when the client's resistance had been overcome and the

girl had a better understanding of her behavior, the social worker, quite obviously, did not dismiss the tools of permissiveness and a nonjudgmental approach. *This is the heart of the problem.*

This girl had sinned; she had perpetrated an evil deed. The whole sordid relationship with her mother was the result of evil. The mother provoked her child to wrath, and the child responded in kind. The social worker was able to help both the mother and daughter see their part in this. Assessing greater or smaller responsibility to the daughter or the mother does not change the fact that both are guilty, that they did evil, and that they need the forgiveness of their sins. At this point they do not need the permissive and nonjudgmental approach of a social worker who feels they should not experience moral pressure because they couldn't help what happened; they need the Law and the Gospel, preached in Christian love to resolve guilt. They need to experience the joy of forgiveness which comes from God.

However, if we look at the recommendations, made by the social worker after therapy had accomplished its objective, we find she still promoted a nonjudgmental and permissive philosophy. She did not dismiss the tools which helped her to effect therapy. She recommended to the pastor that he should, without assessing moral responsibility, view this whole incident as she had done in therapy and subtly implied this would make him more "loving and understanding." She even recommended placing less moral stress on the girl than had been put on her before she got into trouble.

At this point does it not seem to any Christian, and especially to a minister, that

if the social worker insists on a nonjudgmental and permissive approach, she ignores the moral aspect of the girl's sin? Of course, no Christian social worker will admit to this. Love for the person, she will argue, prompts her to want to continue to be permissive and nonjudgmental. She rests her case on the fact that clinical experience has proved the usefulness of being permissive and nonjudgmental in therapy.

But this is not the whole story. To carry over into life these attitudes, useful in therapy, result in a partial, if not total, disintegration of all moral standards. When therapy has been successfully concluded in the sense that the client has confronted and accepted his real problem, which is always sin in one form or another, out of Christian love the client should be given the advantage of having the Law and Gospel applied to his life and this particular problem. The therapist, on the basis of her ability and agency policy, must decide if she will undertake this or if this task should be referred to someone else. But the Law, the antithesis of a permissive and nonjudgmental attitude, must be applied together with the Gospel and dare not be forgotten.

While confusion about these matters does exist, it need not. The principles are simple and clear. The adoption of a permissive and nonjudgmental attitude in order to effect therapy certainly does not conflict with the Christian faith. Outside of therapy only a nonpermissive and proper judgmental attitude is Christian. Of course, in no instance will the social worker force a course of action onto his client. The client has the right to decide what his final destiny will be. The social worker is ob-

ligated to make certain that the client understands the alternate courses of action open to him and might even want to recommend one of them.

There is, therefore, a time for the proper use of therapy in the lives of people. There is also a time when it is of no use. However, therapy, a human tool designed for a specific and limited use, can never—in spite of what some clients and therapists may desire—achieve the final salvation of any person. When therapy is finished, the special and effective principles which make therapy successful are no longer useful to the client.

The probation officer of Case 3 also misused his tools. He promoted the permissive and nonjudgmental principles, effective in therapy, as a way of life for his client. Evidently the probation officer felt that because he accepted (in the clinical sense) this boy's behavior during therapy, there no longer need be any concern about the specific sin of stealing a car nor any pressure, in the healthy sense, to live a moral life according to the wishes of his parents and pastor.

It is also obvious that the group worker (previously referred to) who addressed a gathering of pastors was confused about the use of the tools of his professional training. He actually claimed that because people can at times be helped by not exerting moral pressure—as he had learned in a school of social work—he was more loving than other people who, lacking professional training, exerted moral pressure. This is false. It is true that the therapist has a special contribution to make because of his training and experience in helping people with buried problems. Unless the minister has this same special training, he

will not be able to help in this way. This does not mean, however, that either the pastor or the therapist loves the client more than the other.

Properly using his tools, the therapist has a unique part to play in helping people with problems. However, what about the social worker who does not dismiss his therapy tools, but uses them in all aspects of living, as this group worker apparently was doing? What are the results of such an error? When this mistake is made, all of life is converted into a therapy session. To such a "therapist" the doctrines of sin and grace lose their fundamental value; nothing is absolutely right or wrong; "the therapist" is unable to take sides, especially on moral issues; the doctrine of original sin no longer functions in the mind of the "therapist"; all evil and sin—now called "problems" of the client—are not to be judged for what they are, but to be understood in the light of possible social or emotional factors. In Christian terms the "therapist" is permissive and nonjudgmental toward the world, the flesh, and the devil. Because he is capable of accepting it, the "therapist" unconsciously "loves" sin. As a result, "he helps a client feel more comfortable in his sin," and he gently insists that people, especially ministers, must learn to "accept" the "problem" in their parish-ioners in order to be truly "loving."

The blasphemous and disastrous outcome of this philosophy is that the "therapist" becomes completely self-righteous. One can imagine that even on Judgment Day he will want quietly and confidently to hold up his hand to stop the proceedings and to direct God not to take action until he, the "therapist," can correctly judge the situation. With condescension he will want

to thank Christ for His effort on the cross. The "therapist" will feel prompted to say to Him, "We know you meant well, but you couldn't have fully loved and understood the human heart! You may dispose, as you will, of those who did not respond to my effort in treatment, but those who did must be judged in the light of my special love and understanding!"

Because of these attitudes clergymen have looked with suspicion on the work of many therapists, especially those who confuse the proper use of their therapy tools, look at each other and say, "When, oh, when will these uninformed ministers turn to us for help?"

The question may be asked: Can all social workers do therapy? The answer is no. As a matter of fact, there are professional people, including psychiatrists, who are convinced that social workers should not do therapy at all. They believe that social workers should only give counsel and advice, since in manipulating the environment and in making the best use of welfare services many clients in our complex community need the help of a trained person. Moreover, many social workers make excellent teachers, who are also needed to train students to render these vital services, which can be performed without casework therapy.

However, one special point must be made—*all social workers who have graduated from an accredited school of social work have come in contact with the principles behind casework therapy and made them a part of their training and everyday experience.* If they have not had adequate training in the proper use of these principles they will inevitably misuse them. Their views of moral standards will be

distorted. In many ways the world seeks to banish the fundamental doctrine of original sin. Surely it can find no better way than to assert that genuine love is permissive and nonjudgmental and to relax moral demands.

III

Pastors who may wish to refer a patient for casework therapy will appreciate having some rules to help them determine which social workers should be avoided. Probably the easiest way to guide such clergymen is to list first the kinds of social workers and psychiatrists who may be used safely.

Such a list would probably look something like this:

First choice—the competent Christian psychiatrist who is known to make proper use of his therapy tools and counsels spiritually or refers his patient to the patient's pastor.

Second choice—the competent Christian social worker who makes proper use of his therapy tools and who counsels spiritually or, if this is not within the function of his agency, refers his client to the client's pastor.

Third choice—the competent psychiatrist, even though he may not be a Christian, who makes proper use of his therapy tools and then refers his patient to his pastor for spiritual counseling.

Fourth choice—the competent social worker, even though he may not be a Christian, who makes proper use of his therapy tools and refers his clients to the clients' pastor for spiritual counseling.

To be avoided are the social worker and psychiatrist who misuse the principles be-

hind the therapy process by regarding them as decisive in determining a way of life. When this mistake occurs, from the viewpoint of helpfulness to the client, it is immaterial whether the clinician is Christian or not. In fact, the real tragedy of the Christian social worker, who unknowingly misuses these tools, is that he may be using them in the name of Christ while serving the devil. Obviously, psychiatrists who encourage their patients for any reason whatsoever to leave the church should never be consulted.

The crucial question is: what criteria can be used to determine in which category the social worker or psychiatrist belongs?

If a pastor refers a parishioner to a psychiatrist or social worker, he should stay very much in the case by having periodic talks with the clinician and his parishioner. If it becomes evident during these talks that the therapist works with any of the following ideas, he should not be used again:

1. Morals are a matter of degree.
2. Religion is a neurotic aid.
3. The thought of sin implies that a person is unnecessarily punishing himself.
4. All guilt is a result of a person's life experiences.
5. People should not be judgmental because judgmental attitudes create neuroses in others.
6. The more permissive a social worker is, the more loving he is.

Because the eternal welfare of his parishioner is at stake and because of the

clergyman's deeper knowledge of the human heart, he should make every effort always to remain in control of the situation, to invite discussion with the psychiatrist, and if necessary, to challenge him on religious and moral issues or to recommend that the parishioner seek the services of a more competent therapist.

Summary: Clergymen are seeking help from professional social workers who are capable of providing casework therapy for difficult problems which do not seem to respond to pastoral counseling. When trained social workers make adequate use of the principles of casework, people are helped to give up symptomatic behavior and experience better mental health. Therapy does not "preach" them toward any religious goal. Final decisions concerning the material brought forth by therapy are left to the client and to whomever he might go for further help. Competent therapists do not wish to alter or lower the moral structure of any client.

Some pastors have become uneasy with some social workers. This happens when social workers use the principles effective for providing therapy as a way of life. When this occurs, the social worker's moral standards become distorted, and it is no longer safe to confront a parishioner with him.

The pastor, who shares with clinicians information about what happens in therapy sessions, will soon know which social workers and psychiatrists to employ and which to avoid.

Wauwatosa, Wis.

shi
goe
pec
Ho
we
serv
in t
whi
befo
to f
help
terr
befo
Chr
afte
fort
rari
Lent
who
eatin

Le
the
The
paral
ancie
mary
"S
"Son
love
Israel
out o
11:1
claim

THE ROYAL BANNERS FORWARD GO

I

Matt. 21:28-32

"The royal banners forward go; the Cross shines forth in mystic glow." The meek King goes to the cross. His banners summon His people to repentance, and they call on us. How do we salute those banners? How do we acclaim that Victor-Servant? How do we serve that King? These are good questions in the week before Good Friday. The words which Jesus spoke to His people in the week before Good Friday can serve us and help us to find an answer to our question. They can help us, that is, if we remember that all those terrible things that happened in the week before Good Friday recur—in respectable, Christianized form, of course—in the years after Good Friday. Let us not spend a comfortable week denouncing Jesus' contemporaries. That would not be keeping a true Lent; that would not be a fast, for people to whom we feel superior make mighty good eating. That would be

to quit the dish
of flesh and still
to fill
the platter high with fish.

Let us consider *Jesus' word to the dodgers, the evaders*, and see how they apply to us. The word which the Father speaks in the parable reminds Israel once more of all God's ancient mercy to His people. They are a summary of the whole Old Testament:

"Son, Go Work Today in My Vineyard"

"Son"—the whole grace of God's covenant love for His people is in that word. "When Israel was young, then did I love him, and out of Egypt did I call My son" (Hosea 11:1). "Go work today"—the LORD'S claim upon His people, the fact that He de-

sired the whole man wholly for Himself, appears in those words—"Thou shalt love the LORD, thy God, with all thy heart." And the inescapable urgency of God's claim is spoken once more in "today." "In My vineyard"—the whole scene of man's work and man's history is the LORD's, under His governance. The Creator God, the sovereign Lord of all history, appears in this word. All the grace and power of God that made Israel the Sabbath among the nations appears once more in the words which bid the son give God a son's devotion and render Him a son's service.

We all know what the men of Jesus' generation answered. The young man said, "I go, sir," and went not. Let us not paint this young man too black. He represents the best in Israel. He did not become a hellion. He did not disgrace his parents and squander his patrimony. He did not look on the wine when it was red or consort with loose women. No (and this is what makes this such an embarrassing text to apply to us), our young man pursued wisdom. He became a churchman and a theologian. He probably attended *leb echad* (that's a very rough rendering of "Concordia") Seminary.

Our young man cultivated the liturgical life. He fasted; he tithed; he prayed; and he washed. Jesus' contemporaries were probably the "fastingest," the "tithingest," the "prayingest," the "ablutingest" generation of men under the sun. Moreover, our young man developed an intense missionary activity; he compassed sea and land to make one proselyte. He became a theologian and discussed a whole mess of problems. We are not the first generation of theologians to discuss a wide variety of "The Church and" themes. Our young man had them and discussed them too. He had his *The Church and Society*, his theological-sociological problems.

He was interested in almsgiving, in the right reasons for a valid divorce, and he was interested in the supreme question, too, the question, Who is my neighbor? He had his *The Church and Government* problem, too, his theological-political problem, and he asked, Is it lawful to pay tax to Caesar? *The Church and the Bible* was in his life too; he had his theological-exegetical problem, and he asked, Which is the greatest commandment? He was seeking an integrating principle for a truly Biblical theology.

What was it that made our demure young theologian-churchman an abomination? What made his converts sons of Gehenna? Why did the publicans and harlots go into the Kingdom before him? Where did he fail? *He went not. He remained rooted in himself, cabined, cribbed, confined, bound in by his own religiosity, by his liturgy, his theology. He discussed and groped and fiddled with his problems; he evaded. For our young man knew in his heart of hearts (what we know too) that once we understand and admit that we understand, then we must obey. Then there is only one problem, one that we can't walk around any more, one that we can't discuss any more. This one problem always confronts us head on. Once we know that there is really no problem like "Who is my neighbor?" and know that finding him is not only easy but inevitable; once we face up to the fact that we must take steps if we want to avoid our neighbor, that our neighbor is always lying across our path—then there is only one problem left; then we must love our neighbor as ourselves.*

John the Baptist made plain to his contemporaries that there is only one problem, because there is only One God, and that One God is drawing near in the person of His Son and Servant, the Mightier One. There is only one road to go, that is the road of repentance. The unproblematical publicans and the nonliturgical harlots be-

lieved John the Baptist. But what of our evading theologian? "Ye repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."

Theologians find it hard to repent; they do not often repent. They improve their theology; they rethink their position. They modify their views in the light of new discoveries; they peer into hot caves and find new materials for cool disputings. They take into account, of course, the epoch-making work of the great Dr. Gedankenspritzer. For whatever you may think of the great Dr. Gedankenspritzer, you cannot simply ignore him. (It is academic heresy to say so, but the heretical thought *will* rise, Why *not*, for a change, ignore the current Dr. Gedankenspritzer? It might be a good thing, even for Dr. Gedankenspritzer.)

Jesus loved even the churchmen and the theologians, even the disobedient sons. For us theological sons and for our salvation He was made man. The one obedient Son, the Son who had only one problem, to do the will of the Father who sent Him, He *lived* by the Word that proceeded from the mouth of God and went in free obedience the way which that Word marked for Him, the way to the cross. He redeemed the ruin of our broken "I go, sir" lives by His blood outpoured. He has broken open a path to the vineyard of God for us, a path that we can walk because He has walked it before us and for us. Our liturgy, our activity, our theology need no longer be gifts of God that we use against God, to evade Him. Let us face it: that can happen here and now; that has happened here and now. But it need not happen. Our liturgy, our activity, our theology, yea, even the work of the great Dr. Gedankenspritzer, can be a part of our work today in the vineyard of our Father. For the Cross, the royal banner of our King, blazons forth both: "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee," and

"Son, go work today in My vineyard."

T
mon
sum
tena
vine

T
turie
and
again
free
out
plan
best
the
He l
and
to fu
this

"V
viney
of th
God,
Lord
God
cross
serva
of pr
and
That
ing e
Son."
love
trayal

Th
revel
bellic
and l
keepe
a poi
demo
we'll

II

Matt. 21:33-43

The royal banners forward go; they summon God's sons, and the sons evade the summons. They call on God's workmen, His tenant farmers, to give God the fruits of His vineyard, and God's workmen rebel.

*Jesus' Word to the Rebels:
"Give God What Is God's!"*

That is an old cry, a cry that spans 28 centuries. Isaiah raised that cry; Jesus raised it; and in our 20th century it must be raised again. Isaiah pictured to his generation the free and fostering love of God that chose out Israel to be His pleasant plant. God planted His vineyard in the best soil, on the best site (on a hill where grapes may drink the sun), and gave it the best cultivation. He looked therefore to find noble grapes—and found wild grapes. He looked to Israel to find there a rule of right—and found in this people the misrule of might. (Is. 5)

"What could have been done *more* to My vineyard . . . ?" Israel's history is the record of that miracle of miracles, the "more" of God, that inexplicable onward march of the Lord's love for His people, that impetus of God which finally made His royal banner the cross. That "more" is documented in the servants of the Lord, those waves on waves of prophets who proffered Israel God's grace and bade Israel give God what is God's. That "more" reaches its climax in the sending of the Son. "They will reverence My Son." There is the apex of that love of God, love with defenses down, love that risks betrayal, lost love to the loveless shown.

This is the ultimate grace, the culminating revelation. And it provokes the ultimate rebellion: "This is the Heir; let us kill Him, and let us seize on His inheritance." These keepers of the vineyard saw clearly, up to a point. They saw with the stupid clarity of demonic vision. If we get rid of the Son, we'll be in charge: We'll have it made. The

prophets are dead; we can always reinterpret them to suit our ends, and thus stone them anew. But the Son lives and confronts us. His greatness makes us bow. His obedience indicts us in our rebelliousness. He summons us, inexorably, to give God what is God's.

They got rid of the Son. They caught Him, cast Him out of the vineyard, and slew Him. They got rid of the Son, but they could not seize on His inheritance. They lost the vineyard, and the Stone which they rejected became a rock that ground them to powder.—But there was another chapter of God's love written before that chapter of doom. The Son loved these rebels. Christ interceded for them and died for them. When He arose, He sent His messengers first to them. He let His servants Stephen, James the son of Zebedee, and James the Just die in their witness to them.

Such is our Christ, a Christ who died for rebels. Do we qualify as rebels, now, in the year of our Lord 1961? Can it happen here? Can it be that we drag the Heir out of the vineyard and seek to take over? Our Lord foresaw that it could happen. Salt that does not salt, light that does not shine, workmen who will not give the Lord of the vineyard His fruit—these are three of a kind, all highly "unnatural," all rebellion against the God who creates salt, gives light, and makes men His workmen.

It can happen here; it has happened. The heresies of which we read in the apostolic writings are, all of them, attempts to get the Heir out of the vineyard, attempts to remove the Son and to leave the workmen in charge. The men who strove to make a fair show in the flesh in Galatia; the men in Colossae who restored to honor the principalities and powers which the Christ had spoiled; Cerinthus with his Christ who came by water but not by blood, essentially an uncrucified Christ; the Christ party at Corinth (how neatly the rebellion can disguise itself!) who rose to heights of religious self-fulfillment

and left behind and below them the apostle who knew only the Crucified One—they all "revised" the Christ whom God had given. And every "revised" Christ is a Christ dragged out of the vineyard and slain. For this revised Christ is no longer the Son whose obedience indicts us; He is no longer the Christ whose ransoming cross spells out our bankruptcy.

The Christ, the obedient Son, the Crucified One, comes to us still. He comes to us in the word of His apostles. His presence is a real presence—in a book, a presence as offensive as His presence in the flesh, as offensive as His presence in the bread and wine. When we play off the Christ against the Book, His Book; when we leave the Book and wander out behind the beyond, seeking His presence behind and beyond the Book, we are nudging the real Christ out of the vineyard. We destroy the Heir by excision and revision.

We can destroy the Heir also by substitution. When we play off His Word against His Sacrament or His Sacrament against His Word, let's not delude ourselves about what is going on. It is the same ugly business as that recorded in Matt. 21:33-43. And it is the same ugly business when we set an autonomous *Wissenschaft* over His Word, or a philosophy, or a system; when we substitute a set of principles for the living Lord; when we make of His Sacrament our sacrifice, etc., etc., etc.

We cannot destroy the Heir. But we can destroy ourselves. But we need not destroy ourselves. What can happen after Good Friday, what has happened with an ugly repetitiousness since Good Friday, that need not happen here. The Son and Heir has made us God's pleasant plant; He has made us branches of that one Vine whose fruit was all for God. When He comes to us in the Word of His apostles, we can hear Him speaking to us still and can submit to Him in the obedience of faith. When He comes

to us in the bread and wine and the cry goes up, "Lift up your hearts," we can, in the powers of our communion with Him, reply: "We lift them up unto the Lord."

III

Matt. 22:1-14

The royal banners forward go. They summon God's sons, and the sons evade. They summon God's workmen, and the workmen rebel. They bid God's guests come to the wedding feast, and the guests despise that bidding.

Jesus' Word to the Contemtpuous Guests

The royal banners forward go. And the device upon those banners is grace. It is royal grace, grace bestowed in sovereign freedom, a grace which one cannot induce, cannot claim, cannot compel. One can only receive it. You *get* invited to the king's wedding supper.

It is festal grace, splendid, lavish, extravagant, prodigal. Everybody spends too much on weddings, and so it is just wedding festivity that furnishes the figure for the grace of God. "All things are ready; come unto the marriage!"

It is calling, inviting grace, with a repeated urgent, seeking, and unwearied call. This King will have His chambers filled with guests, no matter what.

It is absolute grace, pure grace, and therefore it is universal grace. This grace invites "both bad and good"; that pretty well covers mankind. No one is excepted; no one is excluded. Only those who refuse this grace prove "unworthy" of it.

And it is personal grace. "The King came in to see the guests"—that is the climax and the meaning of the feast, personal communion, face to face. To him who has abused this grace, the king says, "*Friend*, how camest thou hither?"

Dies Evangelium ist nicht schwer, Luther says. The royal banners forward go, and any

fool
Une
goe
lich
hav
ther
Wh
beh
stre

N
sure
Not
as c
who
fear
of t
mys
fore
brea
"the
And
pelt
is b
leas
the
do a
and
wrat
eous

O
form
when
wed
men
gene
is no
can
fence
is a
riche
high
is th
have
if w
purp

fool can read what is emblazoned on them. *Und ist ein schrecklich Evangelium*, he goes on. What makes this Gospel *schrecklich*? Why does the lighted banquet hall have as its foil the outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth? Why do our Lord's progressing banners leave behind them the bodies of men lying on the streets of their burnt and ruined city?

Nothing is so sure, so wholly sure, so surely sure as God in the giving of His grace. Nothing is so unsure, so fearfully precarious, as our hold upon that grace. Therefore the whole New Testament is filled with faith and fear, with jubilation and trembling, because of this dark mystery of our manhood, the mystery whereof the prophet spoke: "Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread?" We all know, theoretically, that "there is none good but one, that is God." And yet we decide, practically, that some pelting farm or some mincing merchandise is better than that good, that is, right now at least, *pro tem*. And so we "make light" of the inviting God, despise His invitation, and do away with His messengers. That despised and desecrated grace becomes a treasury of wrath against the day of wrath and the righteous judgment of God.

Our Lord speaks also of another, subtler form of making light of God's inviting grace when He speaks of the man who came to the wedding but came without the wedding garment. We all know, theoretically and in general, that God's grace is not a something, is not a bucket of paint in a corner that we can use from time to time to make our black fences white. We know that the king's grace is a personal grace, one that has both enriched us *and* claimed us. We know that the high majesty of God is in that grace, in fact, *is* that grace. And we know that we not only have that grace: We live by it, must live by it if we are to live at all. But for practical purposes and for the time being we live as

if (that diabolical "as if"), as if that grace were separable from God, as if we could hear the Word that proceedeth from the mouth of God and not live by it, as if we could pray half of the Fifth Petition. And so we take our chances on appearing at God's banquet in a robe of our own wearing, in a tissue of lies. We take our chances on hearing that terrible word, "*Friend*, how camest thou hither?"

The royal banners forward go. This is not a parade that we may watch. The banners summon us, God's sons, God's workmen, God's guests. We have the fearful freedom, the freedom to evade, to rebel, to despise. But no; we do not really have it. The Son has set us free from that fatal freedom; He has set us free for God.

MARTIN H. FRANZMANN

POPULATION PROBLEMS

Why all this furor about expanding populations? Why the sudden concern for what has been called the prevalence of people? Have not populations been growing throughout recorded history?

The last statement is true, of course. At the beginning of the Christian era, it is estimated, the world had a population of between 200 and 300 million. By 1650 this number had increased to 500 million. In 1950 the world's population was estimated to be about two and one-half billion. Today it is estimated that the total world population has increased to about two and three-quarters billion.

There are two things which give concern to demographers. The first of these is the increase in absolute numbers. The second is the increase in the rate of population growth.

That there has been an increase in absolute numbers is apparent from the figures cited above. Studies indicate that there has also been an increase in the rate of population growth. Over the past three centuries the rate of population growth averaged about

0.5 per cent a year. During the first 100 years of this period the annual rate was about 0.3 per cent. Between 1900 and 1950 the percentage growth was about 0.9 per cent. Since World War II the rate of population increase has risen to about 1.7 per cent a year. At the rate of world population increase for the period from 1800 to 1850 the present population would double in about 135 years. At the 1900 to 1950 rate it would double in 67 years. But at the present post-war rate it will double in only 42 years.

But there are still other considerations which give concern. The United Nations estimates that between 1950 and 1975 the average annual percentage of increase may, on the basis of a "medium" increase, be 2.1 per cent and between 1975 and the year 2000 almost 2.6 per cent. Such rates of increase will double the population in 33 and 27 years, respectively. On this basis the world's population is expected to be about 3.8 billion by 1975 and 6.3 billion by the year 2000.

Between 1950 and 1975 the United Nations estimates that the population of North America will grow yearly by about 1.7 per cent and that of Europe by about 1.2 per cent. During the same period the population of Asia is expected to grow at an average annual rate of 2.4 per cent; that of Africa by about 2.1 per cent and that of Latin America by about 3.4 per cent. Between 1975 and the year 2000 the rate of increase for North America is expected to decrease to about 1.2 per cent a year and that for Europe to about 1.0 per cent a year. But the annual rate for Asia is expected to increase to about 3.0 per cent, that of Africa to about 2.8 per cent, and that for Latin America to about 3.8 per cent.

Projection of the post-World War II rate of increase gives a population of one person per square foot of land surface of the earth in less than 800 years. It gives a popula-

tion of 50 billions (the highest estimate of the population-carrying capacity of the globe ever calculated by responsible scholars) in less than 200 years. This estimate is based on the assumption that developments in the utilization of solar and nuclear energy will produce energy at a cost so low that it will be feasible to obtain everything that we need from raw sea and air and that men will be satisfied to subsist largely on products from algae farms and yeast factories.

Over the short run, the remaining years of the 20th century, world populations will no doubt be confined to manageable numbers. There is no problem of exhausting the space on the globe, nor is there reason to fear serious decreases in world per capita food supply. This latter is evidenced by projections of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. However, there is good reason to be pessimistic about the possibility of greatly increasing the world's standard of living during this period. In 1950 world per capita income was estimated at \$223. In North America per capita income was \$1,100. To bring the world per capita income by 1975 to the level enjoyed in North America in 1950 would require about a 7.5-fold increase of the 1950 level in 25 years. To do the same by 2000 would require a 12-fold increase in the 1950 world income within 50 years. Such considerations show the weakness of the argument that a solution to the population problem is to be found in a more equitable distribution of the world's food supply or of goods and services in general. The miserably low level of living of most of the world's population is attributable not so much to maldistribution as to low aggregate product, the result of low productivity of most of the world's peoples.

North America in 1950, with about 16 per cent of the earth's land surface, contained less than 9 per cent of the world's population but had about 43 per cent of the world's income. Asia, by way of contrast, with 18

per cent of the world's land surface had 55 per cent of the world's population but only 12 per cent of the world's income. Per capita income in Asia was at a level of about \$50 a year. The major factor underlying this difference is indicated by the contrast in the difference in nonhuman energy consumed in North America and in Asia respectively. In North America over 10,000 kilowatt hours per capita in a year is consumed, while Asia consumes only 300 kilowatt hours per capita in a year. The availability of nonhuman energy for the production of goods and services is probably the best single measure available of differences in capital investment, know-how, and technology. These account for the great differences in productivity and consequently in the size of the aggregate product available for distribution. Much of the progress of Western civilization has been progress in harnessing these various nonhuman energy sources. Beginning with the Industrial Revolution, the power of coal, natural gas, and petroleum has been harnessed. At the present time much research is going into the harnessing of nuclear and solar energy.

The differences in the levels of living are in general inversely related to present and prospective rates of population increase. As we have indicated above, populations of the relatively underdeveloped continents of the world are increasing at a more rapid rate than those of the economically advanced countries. This rapid increase in world population imposes a severe burden on efforts to raise standards of living. Asia, merely to maintain her present low level of living, must increase her aggregate product by 60 per cent between 1960 and 1975, and by an additional 75 per cent between 1975 and 2000. To raise her per capita income to the European level for 1950 while continuing to experience a rapid population growth, Asia would have to increase her 1950 aggregate income 12-fold by 1975 and 21-fold by

2000. To do the same, Africa must increase her aggregate income 8-fold by 1975 and 13-fold by 2000. Latin America will have to increase her aggregate income 4-fold by 1975 and 8-fold by 2000. To achieve a per capita income equal to that of North America in 1950 while experiencing the projected population growth, Asia would have to increase her aggregate income 35-fold by 1975 and 62-fold by 2000. Africa to achieve the same goal would require a 22-fold and 38-fold increase, and Latin America a 12-fold and 23-fold increase.*

Still another problem is the increasing concentration of populations in underdeveloped areas in urban places. In more advanced countries urbanization during the first half of this century was due chiefly to technological advance and to a high standard of living. It was a symbol of man's mastery over nature. In the underdeveloped nations, however, urbanization represents a transfer of rural poverty from an overpopulated countryside to a mass urban setting. In the economically underdeveloped areas of the world urbanization is outpacing economic development and the city is more a symbol of mass misery and political instability than of man's conquest of nature. While the nations of Asia are attempting to improve their miserable urban living conditions, their urban population will continue to increase explosively. Perhaps it will triple within a period of less than one generation.

What has brought about this tremendous increase in world populations? Why is it that the rate of population increase continues to accelerate? The reason is to be seen in the substantial decrease in the death rate. It does not appear that the birth rate itself is increasing substantially. It is remaining about the same as it was at the time when the average life expectancy was only 25 or

* For additional statistics and a more exhaustive treatment of the subject see *Science* 131:1641—7.

30 years. Rather it is the increase in life expectancy that has brought about the tremendous increase in populations. This increase has occurred even in those countries which do not achieve the 68.5 years of average life expectancy we know in the United States. Even a relatively small increase in life expectancy in underdeveloped countries increases the population substantially. There are only three ways to decrease populations: (1) by increasing the death rate, (2) by decreasing the birth rate, and (3) by some combination of the two.

These facts regarding increasing populations pose a great many problems for those of us who must live out our lives during the remaining years of the century. There is no question but that they play a part in the present ideological struggle between East and West. The underdeveloped countries are essentially "have not" countries. Inevitably they are jealous of the "have" nations. These latter not only have the greatest resources at present but are likely to continue to have greater resources than the underdeveloped countries. The tremendous population increases in the underdeveloped nations of the world lead to a great deal of pessimism as to their possibility of raising their standard of living substantially. Certainly, efforts of these underdeveloped countries to bring population into balance with available resources

ought to be encouraged. God commanded the father of us all to rule over the earth and subdue it. Those who are poorly fed, ill housed, and inadequately clothed are in no position to exercise this rule.

Moreover, we ought to do all that we can to assist these people in solving their problems. We must be careful not to do this by insisting that the American way is always the best way. It is a fact that China is able to support its population on much less land than we need for a mere subsistence level. The Chinese could not afford to adopt our American agricultural methods, good as they are. To do so would result in mass starvation.

There is also a tremendous mission challenge in these expanding populations. To these people the Gospel of Christ must be brought. We need to redouble our mission efforts, for we are living in the time when Christianity is becoming more and more a minority religion.

The best minds of our society will have to wrestle with this problem of expanding population. We do not have a population problem in the United States at the present time. But it is possible that one day we shall have one. We need to do all that we can to increase our productivity, and we need to share this productivity and the know-how which produces it with underdeveloped nations of the world.

JOHN W. KLOTZ

LUTHERAN AND PROTESTANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

North America, 1960—1961

<i>Lutheran Synods</i>	Year	Schools	Teachers	Enrollment
The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod	1960	1,293	5,319	149,201
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod	1960	218	795	24,082
Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (Slovak)	1958	2	5	155
Evangelical Lutheran Synod (Norwegian)	1959	14	18	420
Total, Synodical Conference		1,527	6,137	174,858
The American Lutheran Church	1960	48	233	5,104
Augustana Lutheran Church	1960	2	15	290
National Evangelical Lutheran Church	1960	1	2	50
United Lutheran Church in America	1960	9	69	1,157
Non-Synodical Conference Lutherans		60	319	6,601
Total, All Lutheran Bodies		1,587	6,456	181,459

Protestant Denominations

National Union of Christian Schools	1960	206	1,400	39,554
National Association of Christian Schools	1960	146	856	14,845
Seventh-day Adventists	1960	1,046	2,347	43,715
Mennonite Christian Day Schools	1959	153	—	7,568
Los Angeles Baptist City Mission Society	1960	22	140	3,248
Southern Baptist Convention	1959	56	165	3,485
Protestant Episcopal Church	1960	384	—	—
Religious Society of Friends	1959	38	—	5,436
Presbyterian Church, U. S.	Small number of schools			—
Total, Protestant Denominations		2,051		117,851
Total, Lutheran and Protestant Schools		3,638		299,310*

* Plus enrollment in 384 Protestant Episcopal schools and a small number of Presbyterian schools for which statistics were not available.

LUTHERAN AND PROTESTANT HIGH SCHOOLS

<i>High Schools, Lutheran Synods</i>	Year	Schools	Teachers	Enrollment
The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod	1960	19*	425	8,972
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod	1960	8*	97	1,866
Total		26*	522	10,838

* One school is maintained jointly by the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods for a net total of 26 schools. The school is credited to each group except in the net total of 26 schools. Each group is credited with its share of the enrollment.

High Schools, Protestant Denominations

National Union of Christian Schools	1960	27	351	17,756
Seventh-day Adventists	1960	250	786	6,539
National Association of Christian Schools	1960	34	219	3,562
Religious Society of Friends	1959	24	—	5,567
Mennonite	1959	7	—	1,325
Total		342		34,749

*Boarding High Schools Connected with Colleges
for Ministerial and Teacher Training*

The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod	1960	10	—	1,393
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod	1960	4	79	915
Total		14		2,308

Boarding Academies for General Education

Seventh-day Adventists	1960	50	584	10,048
National Association of Christian Schools	1960	21	193	1,830
Protestant Episcopal Church	1960	93	—	—
		164		11,878*
Total, all Lutheran and Protestant High Schools		546	—	59,773

* Plus the enrollment in 93 Protestant Episcopal schools.

WM. A. KRAMER, *Secretary of Schools*

1960 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STATISTICS

The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

<i>North America Only</i>	1959	1960	Net Gain	Net Loss
Number of Schools	1,284	1,293	9	
Enrollment	144,240	149,201	4,961	

Men Teachers:

Graduates, Teachers Colleges or Colloquized	1,909	1,973	64	
Students, Mo. Synod Teachers Colleges	105	85	—	20
Students and Graduates, Other Luth. Colleges	60	51	—	9
Other Men Teachers	64	76	12	
Pastors Teaching	14	16	2	
Total — Men Teachers	2,152	2,201	49	

Women Teachers:

Graduates, Synodical Conf. Teachers Colleges	489	568	79	
Students, Mo. Synod Teachers Colleges	368	352	—	16
Students and Graduates, Other Luth. Colleges	580	601	21	
Other Women Teachers	1,342	1,504	162	
Emergency Teachers	110	92	—	18
Total — Women Teachers	2,889	3,117	228	
Total Men and Women Teachers	5,041	5,318	277	

<i>South America Only</i>	1959	1960	Loss *
Number of Schools	151	120	31
Enrollment	7,860	7,043	817
Number of Teachers	225	222	3

<i>Total Statistics for the Synod</i>	North America	South America	Total	Net Gain	Net Loss
Number of Schools	1,293	120	1,413		22 *
Enrollment	149,201	7,043	156,244	4,144	
Men Teachers	2,201	137	2,338	35	
Women Teachers	3,117	85	3,202	239	
Total Teachers	5,318	222	5,540	274	

* Previous Brazil figures included some part-time agencies which were not really parochial schools. Their elimination from the statistics resulted in the seeming losses. The "losses" therefore merely represent more accurate statistics.

NOTE: The statistics are 100% complete.

WM. A. KRAMER, *Secretary of Schools*

1960 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STATISTICS BY DISTRICTS

North America Only

Teachers

Districts	Schools	G/L	Enrollment	G/L	Men	G/L	Women	G/L	Total	G/L
Alta.-British Col.	6	—	239	+ 21	2	— 1	7	—	9	— 1
Atlantic	43	+ 3	6,206	+ 605	88	+ 13	152	+ 14	240	+ 27
Calif.-Nev.	39	—	3,723	+ 14	49	— 2	93	+ 15	142	+ 13
Central	107	— 1	14,767	+ 175	256	+ 5	255	+ 15	511	+ 20
Central Illinois	34	—	4,028	+ 169	53	— 1	87	+ 6	140	+ 5
Colorado	25	— 1	2,837	— 89	37	— 2	68	+ 4	105	+ 2
Eastern	28	+ 1	2,234	+ 215	37	— 1	50	+ 7	87	+ 6
English	33	— 1	4,140	+ 272	56	— 2	102	+ 20	158	+ 18
Florida-Georgia	26	+ 2	2,525	+ 293	15	— 1	89	+ 13	104	+ 12
Iowa East	21	—	1,552	+ 46	21	— 3	37	+ 5	58	+ 2
Iowa West	23	+ 1	1,653	— 5	25	+ 3	42	—	67	+ 3
Kansas	30	— 5	2,710	— 9	50	— 4	56	+ 3	106	— 1
Manitoba-Sask.	2	+ 1	45	+ 24	—	—	2	+ 1	2	+ 1
Michigan	113	+ 1	16,951	+ 474	278	+ 8	266	+ 14	544	+ 22
Minnesota	79	—	7,049	+ 81	90	+ 2	166	+ 10	256	+ 12
Montana	4	—	371	+ 19	4	—	11	+ 3	15	+ 3
North Dakota	6	— 1	453	+ 16	6	— 1	12	+ 1	18	—
North Wisconsin	29	+ 1	3,822	+ 119	48	+ 10	79	+ 2	127	+ 12
Northern Illinois	109	— 6	17,323	+ 245	278	+ 5	318	+ 20	596	+ 25
Northern Nebraska	31	— 1	2,434	+ 98	35	— 3	53	+ 5	88	+ 2
Northwest	23	+ 1	2,000	+ 148	29	+ 3	47	+ 6	76	+ 9
Oklahoma	10	+ 1	802	+ 120	9	+ 2	18	— 1	27	+ 1
Ontario	1	—	66	— 6	2	—	1	—	3	—
South Dakota	6	—	304	— 9	5	—	10	+ 1	15	+ 1
South Wisconsin	64	+ 1	10,850	+ 387	152	+ 5	198	+ 7	350	+ 12
Southeastern	52	+ 3	4,348	+ 235	39	— 1	121	+ 13	160	+ 12
Southern	18	+ 3	1,922	+ 326	16	—	53	+ 6	69	+ 6
Southern Calif.	60	+ 8	7,253	+ 515	101	+ 3	160	+ 23	261	+ 26
Southern Ill.	30	— 1	3,052	+ 56	45	+ 2	58	+ 2	103	+ 4
Southern Nebraska	47	—	2,821	+ 135	54	+ 4	57	— 1	111	+ 3
Texas	85	—	7,849	+ 111	129	+ 3	181	+ 7	310	+ 10
Western	109	— 1	12,872	+ 160	192	+ 3	268	+ 7	460	+ 10
Totals	1,293	+ 9	149,201	+ 4,961	2,201	+ 49	3,117	+ 228	5,318	+ 277

CECIL E. PIKE, *Bureau of Statistics*

HOMILETICS

Outlines on the Old Testament Eisenach Series

By HERBERT E. HOHENSTEIN

EASTER DAY

Ps. 118:14-24

This is the day! This is the great Christian feast day, and that's why the psalm before us is so fitting. For its theme is

This Is the Day!

I. On which God's great hand acted (vv. 15, 16)

A. It had to act because the hands of our first parents reached up to take the forbidden fruit from the tree. By that act mankind ever since has been in the hands of sickness, suffering, and death.

B. And act it did! That great hand of God created the wonder of wonders, a baby in the Virgin's womb. That hand of God was active in the life of Christ, healing diseased bodies, raising lifeless bodies, thus bringing God's rule over the powers of hell and darkness. And then the hand of God effectually went to work when Christ's hands were fixed to the cross to loose us from our sins. Still that mighty arm was not finished with its task. Easter dawned, and that strong hand of God reached down, rolled back the rock from Christ's tomb, and raised His dead Son to new and never-ending life. From the silent and gloomy halls of death, God called forth His Son to the light of endless life.

II. On which the rejected Stone became the Cornerstone (v. 22)

A. He seemed such a small, worthless, unglamorous stone. "What good thing can come out of Nazareth?" The Jews of His day stumbled over Jesus just because He was so common, earthy, so very frail and human. They expected a God whose pomp, power,

and manifest glory would leave them open-mouthed and wide-eyed. Instead, He was born in a stable, rode as their King on a donkey, and said He was worse off economically than the birds and the foxes. The chosen people did not choose to look down to such ordinary things; they were looking up for spectacular things. Therefore they stumbled over the lowly Jesus. They rejected Him, even to the point of nailing Him to the cross.

B. But on this day Christ became the Cornerstone.

1. The stone went rolling from His vacated grave. He burst the bonds of death. Now He has indeed become the great living Stone who has rolled over and crushed to powder death, devil, and hell, the great living Stone who has crushed the life out of our sins. They are dead, those sins of ours, and no longer have strength or breath to condemn us. (Cf. Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7)

2. By breaking out of His stony grave, Christ has become the Cornerstone of His church. This Easter miracle is the foundation stone of our faith. For a dead Christ means an empty faith, sins still very much alive to accuse and torment us, victorious death. If Christ is still in a Palestinian grave, then life isn't worth living, pain isn't worth bearing, and death isn't safe dying. But He did come back, and now our faith and the church rest on a cornerstone that can't be budged.

III. On which we remind ourselves really to celebrate the Easter Victory

A. Easter dare never become simply a day of high emotions, a day when our spirits tingle and soar to the stirring victory hymns,

only to allow all to be forgotten as we settle back again into the comfortable and pleasant routine of our daily lives and sins.

B. No, Easter is the oxygen of the Christian. He lives and breathes Easter.

1. In his confident faith, with the poet of this psalm, he joyfully shouts: "I shall not die, but I shall live!" (v. 17) This faith gives a fresh bounce to his walk and brightens every sorrow. This faith gives him the courage he needs to live cheerfully and calmly.

2. In his holy living (vv. 19, 20). With his fellow saints this glad Easter Day the Christian enters the gates of God's house to sing his praise to God, who has forever halted the relentless march of decay by the raising of Christ. And in the midst of his worshipping fellow saints the Christian gets the power he needs to become a better "church of the Spirit" during the week. He goes to church to be a better church, a better temple of the Holy Ghost, filled ever more and more with holy desires and impulses. Only thus do you truly celebrate Easter.

QUASIMODOGENITI

GENESIS 32:22-31

These Bible words tell us what happened

At the Brook

I. *Jabbok was the name*

It is called the *ez Zerk* today. That means "the blue." This is probably an accurate description of how Jacob felt on that night long ago when he crossed the Jabbok, mighty blue. For one thing, he was alone. For another, he was worried, worried about his brother Esau. Would he still be angry and hateful and in a murderous mood when they met? Jacob was also worried about God. How did the Lord feel toward him after his wicked and wily deception of Esau? Did He still love him? Would He still bless him and be with him? Yes, Jacob probably felt mighty blue by the blue brook, Jabbok.

II. *There was a wrestling match (v. 24)*

A. It was a tough match

1. For Jacob

a. This was a long bout. It lasted all the night. Not just a few brief moments but an all-night battle. It is safe to say that this wasn't Jacob's first wrestling match or that he engaged in this sport just a few times a year. You don't wrestle all night unless you're in good shape from a lot of hard wrestling.

b. This was a painful bout. These two wrestlers weren't faking or playing games. This wasn't a typical television match meant to look vicious and bone-crushing but in reality just good faking. Nor was this match meant to entertain. These men were playing for keeps. This bout cost Jacob a dislocated thighbone.

2. For us.

a. You, too, often have long wrestlings with God. Perhaps for months or even years you have been grappling with God in prayer for the thing so dear to your heart and so desperately needed by your dear ones, for things you are sure you must have for peace and contentment. But the match goes on. Who will outlast and outwrestle whom? At times you are so downcast and discouraged. Your prayer arms ache and are fatigued from all that wrestling, and you are tempted to quit and to acknowledge defeat.

b. You, too, often have known pain in wrestling with God. Perhaps it isn't your thighbone that gets dislocated in these wrestlings, but it surely seems that your heart is being broken.

B. It was a match that Jacob refused to lose (v. 26).

1. Was it right for Jacob to talk like this: "God, I am going to hang on to You, wrap my wrestling arms about You until You give me what I want, Your blessing"? Was it right for Jacob to be so bold with God?

a. Yes, since Isaac had pronounced God's blessing upon him (Gen. 27:28, 29). It is true, Jacob got this blessing by sinful trickery, but that deception did not destroy the validity and effectiveness of the blessing. Or had it? That was Jacob's worry, and that is why he wrestled so with the Lord until God did bless him and thus verify and confirm the blessing that Father Isaac had pronounced upon him years before.

b. Yes, since God Himself had promised to bless Jacob (Gen. 28:10-15). In a sense, Jacob was simply trying to wrestle from God what the Lord Himself had already given him, the divine blessing. Thus Jacob was insisting that God keep His promise.

2. Can you be a Jacob with God?

a. Of course you can. For when you say, "God, I am not going to let You go unless You bless me," you are simply demanding from the Lord what He has already done for you. For what does Paul write in the opening lines of his Letter to the Ephesians? "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who *has* blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing." In Christ, God has already blessed us, blessed us with pardon, resurrection, the eternal joy and life and glory of heaven. This blessing you can demand from God. You can say, "God, I won't let You go unless You forgive me." He already has, by the death and resurrection of Jesus, His Son. You can say, "God, I won't let You go or let go of life unless You raise me from my coffin." He already has when He brought Christ back from His vainly guarded grave. You can say, "God, I won't let You go unless You bring me to heaven." He already has when He raised Jesus on high 40 days after His rending of the tomb.

b. But you can't insist that God keep His promises at precisely the time and in the precise manner His people desire. This is tempting God. Therefore although the Lord promises us His protection, we never have the

right to demand it from Him in our way. We do not merit it simply because He has promised it.

III. Jacob received a new name (vv. 27, 28)

1. He needed one. For Jacob means "take hold of." This underscores Jacob's selfishness. Jacob — the name means "to defraud." And that is precisely what Jacob did: he defrauded his brother Esau of the birthright blessing.

2. He got a new name, Israel. That means "you have fought with God and won." The point is that if one wins out over the mighty God, certainly one is more than a victor over men and over all misery.

3. And what about you? Like Jacob, you, too, have had a change of names. It happened in your Baptism. In that act you received a new name, the child of God. You became an Israelite according to the spirit. And remember, the name "Israel" means "one who has fought with, and won over, God." If you have fought and won out over God, how can any sin or sorrow conquer you?

IV. Jacob saw God's face (v. 30)

Despite the fact that he saw God's face, Jacob lived. You and I live precisely *because* we have seen God's face — the face of God in Jesus Christ. That's what Christ is: God's face in our flesh. It is a face lined and furrowed from all our temptations and griefs, a face twisted from the torture of His Passion and cross, a face with the mask of death, a face full of new life again. We look at the face of God in Christ, and because of that look we live.

MISERICORDIAS DOMINI

PSALM 23

This is

A Poem That Flattens and Fortifies

I. It flattens

A. This is a fact and teaching of Psalm 23 which is often overlooked. Everyone thinks

of this psalm as a comfort poem, a poem that lifts and fortifies weak hearts and trembling spirits. And it is just that. But it also flattens. It takes the starch right out of our proud self-reliance. It deflates us, forces us to recognize and face up to our frailties and inabilities.

B. How so? The moment that you call God your Shepherd you confess that you are a sheep, and think what that means! It means that you are not too intelligent. It isn't "wise as sheep" but "wise as owls." It means that we are not too strong. Whoever heard of someone saying, "He's strong as a sheep?" No, it's strong as an ox, or a lion; sheep are very frail. It means that we are not too holy. What are the adjectives we often use in connection with sheep? Black, or straying.

C. Of course, we say with might and main, "The Lord is my Shepherd." But then realize how such a confession flattens you, takes the starch right out of your pride and self-reliance. For sheep are stupid, weak, and straying creatures. They need a shepherd, and so do we.

II. *It fortifies*

How this poem lifts and fortifies us for life's uncertainties, lacks, and sufferings!

A. The Lord is our Shepherd. And who is this Lord?

1. The Lord, who became a sheep with us. The Shepherd became a sheep when God became a man in Christ. Know the comfort of this. For the Shepherd experienced how hard it is to be a good sheep, how full of temptation and suffering is the life of a frail sheep. He knows how tempting it is to be a black sheep. Christ can say, "I know My sheep, know personally from My own agonizing experiences the difficulties of the sheep." When you yourself have gone through trouble, you are not so ready to criticize, or to find fault, and to be irritated with, the person who is troubled by the same

sin you have had to fight, the same suffering you have had to endure. So it is with Christ. He doesn't shake His head in amazement or disgust over you when you stray or are weak in suffering. His is a sympathetic understanding, for He knows. He became a sheep with us.

2. He is called a Lamb, a lamb like that Passover Lamb by whose lifeblood the Israelites were spared from death in Egypt. Even so our Passover Lamb was sacrificed on the cross to deliver us from eternal death. There is a big difference, however. The Passover Lamb was not revived again. Jesus Christ was!

3. He can be compared to a goat. The Old Testament describes the ritual of the goat chosen to bear the sins of the people away from the camp and out into the desert. There in the desert the goat died with the people's sins. Even so Jesus Christ walked out of the city of Jerusalem bearing our sins upon His back to the cross. He died, and our sins died with Him.

B. The Lord is *our* Shepherd. That means that He is a shepherd of each one of us. He does not simply shepherd statistics. He shepherds sheep, each sheep. He calls us by name and not number. Each sheep is loved; each sheep is important; each sheep is famous and noticed in the eyes of the Shepherd. You'll never be lost sight of or swallowed up in the crowd.

C. Therefore you won't lack a thing the Shepherd knows you need. This doesn't mean that you won't lack anything that you want; this would be a dangerous thing. It would be like a three-year-old insisting that his father give him a butcher knife to play with. The father says No only because he loves the child. And even so our good Shepherd must sometimes say No to us, to our desires, only because He loves us. But since He is the Good Shepherd, whatever He gives us must also be good for us.

D. Your Shepherd regulates your diet (v.2). After the sheep have filled their stomachs on the lush, green grass, the shepherd compels them to lie down and rest awhile lest the foolish flock in their desire for more food rush off to another pasture and bloat themselves and become terribly sick. The shepherd knows how to regulate the diet of his sheep. And so does our Good Shepherd. He knows when to give us the green grass of joy and when to make us eat on the parched meadows of suffering. He knows how much we should have of both prosperity and joy. He is the daily dietitian and not you.

E. Your Shepherd leads you beside restful waters (v.2). These are quiet streams and not torrents where the current is dangerous or icy. He leads us by cool pools of stillness where we can find safe refreshment and life again. However, the rest that our Shepherd gives us is not an end in itself; it is a means to refresh us and to restore us for a renewed walking on the hard and difficult paths of righteousness.

F. He leads us in straight paths for His name's sake (v.3). This means that the Shepherd, not the sheep, is alone responsible for their walking on holy paths. He is both the Leader on these paths and the one who enables them by His power to walk those paths of righteousness. The comfort, of course, is obvious. If our staying on the path that leads to eternal life is in the strong hands of the Shepherd and not in our weak and frail hands, then surely we can never fall away; surely no one can pluck us out of His hand.

G. He is with us in death (v.4). What a comfort to know that as we approach the valley of death, the Shepherd still leads us, still goes before us and points for us the way. Wouldn't it be a horrible experience if at the entrance of this valley our Good Shepherd would say, "I am sorry, My sheep, but this is one path I do not know. I have

never walked it before and therefore I cannot lead you." So we would have to stumble into this valley with fear, not knowing the way. But this is not the case; the Good Shepherd still leads us in the valley of death, for He has walked into it and out again for our salvation. He leads us with confidence into this dark valley and out of it again to the light of endless life. With His rod the Good Shepherd beats off our enemies, the devil and his wolf-pack of evil, who would try to snatch us into the den of hell. With His staff, His Shepherd's crook, the Good Shepherd keeps us on the path that leads through the valley of death to the fold of heaven.

H. Our Shepherd spreads a feast before us (v.5). The picture here is of the shepherd who prepares good and safe grazing land for his sheep. He sees to it that the land is cleared of sharp rocks and of brambles that would hurt his sheep. He sees to it that the pasture land is as safe as possible from the sheep's natural enemies — the wolf, the bear, the snake, and the lion. And even so Jesus, our good Shepherd, has prepared for us the good and safe grazing land of each tomorrow. He is already out there in the future preparing that pasture for us.

I. He pours oil over our heads. This is undoubtedly that potion of fermented hemp or barley mixed with healing herbs which the shepherd pours over the bruised head and sides and back of his sheep at the end of the day in order to heal their hurts and wounds. Even so our Good Shepherd continually pours over us the healing medicine of His Word with all of its wonderful comforts and promises.

J. He gives us an invigorating cup ("My cup runs over"). The picture here is of the tonic which the shepherd often gives to revive and invigorate his weary sheep. Even so our Lord gives us the invigorating cup of His Word, His Word so crammed full of those

precious
faint

K.
merc
Engl
the I
that
does,
punis
us K
where
canno
lovin

L.
now,
of a
cause
cause
narth
nave
we li
God's
the m
beaut
God

JUBIL

If
God,
points

I. W

Thi
A.
"holy"
the C
set as
Suppe
aside
tion, f
God th
dearest
own S
cared

precious promises that once again revive our fainting spirits.

K. He pursues us with His goodness and mercy. The word translated "follow" in the English text is a rather weak translation of the Hebrew verb. It means "to pursue," and that is precisely what our Good Shepherd does, chases us wherever we go—not to punish us for our sins but to bestow upon us His goodness and mercy. No matter where we go or where we are, we simply cannot escape from this loving pursuit of our loving God.

L. We'll live in His house forever. Right now, our life is like being in the narthex of a beautiful cathedral. Even the narthex causes us to stand in awe and wonder because of its beauty. And we conclude, if the narthex is so beautiful, how much more the nave of the church! In this beautiful world we live in we are only in the narthex of God's church, and in death we pass from the narthex into the nave, and then what beauty we shall behold in the house of our God forever.

JUBILATE

ISAIAH 40:26-31

If there is one thing you cannot do with God, it's to classify Him. For as this passage points out

He's in a Class by Himself

I. *Who is? The Holy One (v. 25)*

This description underscores

A. God's dedication. That's what the word "holy" means: "dedicated." For example, the Communion chalice has been dedicated, set aside exclusively for use in the Lord's Supper. God is dedicated, has set Himself aside exclusively for you, for your preservation, for your salvation. So dedicated was God the Father to you that He gave up His dearest treasure, the jewel of His heart, His own Son—for your eternal joy. So dedicated was God the Son that He gave you

not simply presents from Himself but Himself as the present, His life laid down and taken up again, so that you might have the forgiveness and fellowship of God forever. So dedicated is the Spirit that He spends all His time giving you Christ, keeping you with Christ, and making sure that you stay on the path to heaven.

B. God is holy; that means, secondly, that He is unique. And why is God so different? Merely because He is so high and mighty? No, because He is so forgiving (Is. 55:6-9). These words prove that God's uniqueness lies in His constant willingness to forgive. We often think that God's thoughts and ways are most clearly seen and felt in the sufferings He sends us. Not true! His unsearchableness lies primarily in the pardon He keeps lavishing upon us. It is not in the pains that He sends but in the pardon He bestows so freely, gladly, and everlastingly that God is unique. And it is this uniqueness that should cause us to shake our heads in amazement—His everlasting willingness to forgive.

II. *And here is why*

A. He is the Creator of the stars. And what a Creator! We are told by the psalmist that the heavens are the work of God's fingers. So strong is this mighty God of ours that He scarcely exerted Himself in making this great universe.

B. He is the Preserver of the stars. God didn't simply set the stars in motion and then leave for an eternal vacation, letting them shift and wander through space on their own. No, this is what He does: Like a shepherd He calls the stars out each night to their heavenly pasture; He even calls them by name and is concerned if just one from this heavenly herd is missing.

C. This Shepherd of the stars is also the Shepherd of Israel. Israel, of course, refused to believe this, for the people kept saying that all their troubles were concrete proof that God wasn't at all aware of them or concerned about them. He had lost sight of His

people. But the Lord replies, "How can you talk like that? If I don't lose count of a single star in My countless heavenly flock, if I give such individual care and attention to a lifeless star, how could I ever lose sight of you, My living and beloved children? Could I cherish and love a lifeless mass more than you?" What a comfort these words are to us! For we are sometimes tempted to say, "My way of suffering is hidden from the Lord. He doesn't know how I am afflicted. He has overlooked and forgotten about me." Do you really think you are of less value in God's sight than a star? To what star did God ever say, "I give you my only Son to be your Savior"? To what star did He ever say, "The very hairs of your head are all numbered"? To what star did He ever say, "I've tattooed you on the palm of My hand"? It isn't to stars that God speaks promises like these but to you. Then how can you say that God has overlooked or ignored you?

D. He doesn't run down or wear out (v. 28).

1. This holds true of God's love. He once said, "I have loved you with an *everlasting* love." He also indicated that the mountains, those towering, majestic symbols of strength and permanency, would go before His love leaves you. Have you seen any mountains taking a stroll outside your home lately? Then, no matter what leaves—your health, your wealth, your loved ones, or your very life—God's love is still with you, the love that sent Christ to a cross and then raised Him from the grave for your salvation. God said you will be able to break the law of day and night, you will be able to stop the sun from rising, before you can cause His love to set upon you. You'll be able to stop the shades of night from falling before you can fall from His everlasting arms. Since the arms of Christ were once raised and stretched on a cross for the blotting out of your sins, you are in God's arms forever.

2. This holds true of God's power.

a. This is what God was saying to Israel: "I did not sink down weary or exhausted after My creative activity. I didn't spend My energy after rescuing you from Egypt; I flicked Pharaoh and his hosts off Me as a man flicks away a fly. Therefore, don't ever get the foolish notion that My power to help and save is diminishing and running down. I haven't weakened one iota. I am still at full strength for you."

b. And even so God still speaks to us. God, who parted the Red Sea for His hemmed-in Hebrews long ago and made for them a path of safety from their enemies, can still do the same for you as you are surrounded by your sufferings. He can part the waters before you and make a way of escape.

c. Yet God gives this power only to

(1) The faint and exhausted (v. 29). This is the point. You cannot pour water into a glass already full. Nor can God pour His power into people full of their own. First they must be emptied of the foolish reliance upon themselves before they can count on God. And suffering does this emptying (2 Cor. 12:9, 10). You see, your sufferings are God's way of saying, "You still need a little more emptying of your own power before I can pour in My strength. Then you will be invincible."

(2) Those who wait for it (vv. 30-31)

(a) This is what God was saying to Israel: "Look, stop all your running, your scurrying to and fro in frantic but futile efforts to get out of your messes and miseries. All your own schemes and devices won't work. For even at best, no matter how hard and long you run, you are still going to drop down utterly exhausted and done in. For even youths and young men faint and become weary. No, the solutions to your problems are not in running but in waiting on Me—waiting with the sureness and confidence of those who watch for the morning.

They know it is coming. There is no doubt about it. Even so you know that I am coming in My good time and according to My carefully and lovingly laid plans for your benefit, coming to rescue you from all your afflictions. Therefore wait. And if you wait with that hope, you will find your strength to endure renewed, you will get the wings of an eagle and rise and fly above all your suffering. Then indeed you will run and not be weary, you will walk and not be faint. For only waiters are good runners."

(b) Is it just to Israel that God speaks these words? Of course not. He still speaks them — to us. You, too, have your wings. Start flying.

CANTATE

PSALM 98

The theme of this day and of this sermon is

Sing

I. Sing

That's easy to do when life's a lark and a breeze and one's troubles are few and far between. But when you are deep in distress, then singing comes a bit harder. It's sighing and not singing that issues from your lips. Can you sing in suffering? Remember, Paul and Silas did when they were in the jail at Philippi and their backs were bruised and bleeding from the whipping they had just received. Perhaps it would be easier to sing if you would remember that thunderstorms bring the necessary rain. Were it not for the storms that bring refreshing rain, the plants would wither and dry. And even so the storms of suffering that bring pain and affliction bring with them the necessary rain to refresh and to reinvigorate the wilting, drooping plant of our faith.

II. Sing unto the Lord

A. The Hebrew word designates the God of promise, the God who once made a marriage promise to Israel, pledging Himself to be her husband forever.

B. Even so God has married us in the

baptismal rite, and what a love our heavenly Husband bestows upon us! It is not just a love of words—but of actions! God so loved us that He gave, and gave not just honeyed words, not just love letters dripping with beautiful phrases. No, God gave His only Son into death and then raised Him to new and never-ending life, that we might have pardon and be assured of the gladness of heaven.

III. Sing a new song

A. This was the old song: "Good Lord, deliver us from devil, death, hell, all our sins and sufferings."

B. This is the new song: "God has delivered us by the life, death, resurrection, home-going, present prayers and rule and future return of Jesus Christ." By these events and through this Son, God had rescued us from every evil of body and life for the joys of the world to come.

C. This is the only kind of song you can sing, for after all, you are a *new* person. That's what St. Paul writes: "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature." This means, of course, that the old things have passed away, the old sins, the old fears, the old hates, the old goals. How does St. Paul put it? "If you have been raised with Christ, set your longings on the things above where Christ sits on the right hand of God." We remember, however, that even though we are new creatures plenty of the old man still remains. This is said for our comfort lest we be depressed and give way to despair over our apparent inability ever completely to master our sinful selves.

IV. Why?

A. Because God has done marvelous things. This word "marvelous" is used elsewhere in the Old Testament to describe God's making and preserving of His world and of His creatures. It also refers to His marvelous rescue of His people from Egypt and at the Red Sea. Above all, it refers to that child born of a virgin. This Immanuel is called

Wonderful, Counselor. Christ is the supreme wonder, for by Him we don't have to wonder about our sins any more. Are they forgiven? Will God hold them against us? By this wonderful Child of Mary we know that our sins are pardoned. Now we don't wonder any more about death. Will it claim us and chain us forever? Of course, it won't. For the wonderful Child of Mary has done a most marvelous thing. He has burst the bonds of death and triumphed over the tomb! And to us He says, "Because I live, you shall live also." There is no doubt about it.

B. God's right hand and holy arm have obtained the victory. There are some 250 references to the hand of God in the Bible. Most of these stress the might and mercy of that arm in delivering the Hebrew people from Egypt. The bolstering conclusion, of course, is this: If that great arm of God accomplished such a rescue in the past, nothing is too difficult for it in the future. With the prophet we too say: "Behold, the Lord's arm has not been shortened that it cannot save!" It is not too short to reach and rescue you from your deepest sin or suffering. It is you who are often short on the necessary faith to take hold of that rescuing arm.

1. There is protection in God's arm. With the prophet we say, "In the shadow of His hand He has hid me." Yet you are not just under God's hand; you are on it. For He has carved and engraved you on His palm and indelibly tattooed you there. You are united with the great God Himself. Can God be conquered? Of course not. And since you are His, neither can you. Can God die? Of course not. And since you are His, neither can you.

2. There is correction in God's hand. Peter writes, "Humble yourselves under God's mighty hand." Exaltation will, of course, follow in due time; that is, when we are precisely ripe for it and not before. God knows best when to remove His correcting

hand. It is interesting to note also that Saint Peter in this passage (1 Peter 5:6, 7) tells us to humble ourselves under God's mighty hand by throwing all of our worries upon Him. This is one of the greatest prides of all: to worry, to take into our hands a responsibility which belongs to God alone—the care and government of our future.

3. God's arm has obtained the victory. It certainly has! The arms of Jesus were cruelly stretched on the cross and then folded in death. On Easter, God's strong arm reached down and revived the dead Christ. By these acts God's mighty arm has obtained the victory, our victory over Satan, sin, and hell.

C. God has remembered His love and faithfulness (v. 3). You see, it is not your forgiven sins which God remembers but His love and faithfulness. It must be this way because of Christ Jesus, the Cloud, Christ, the thick Cloud, that stands constantly between God's searching eye and our sin. Because of that Cloud God does not see our sins, He forgives.

D. Because this is the way you give the Spirit to one another (Eph. 5:18, 19). A good singing church is a good Spirit-giving church. We do not sing on Sundays simply to entertain ourselves or to have the thrill of singing; no, we sing to one another "in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, making melody in our hearts," in order that we might help one another to be filled with the Holy Spirit.

E. Because you cannot do less than creation (vv. 7-9).

1. Why is the world singing? Because the Lord is coming, not just to judge but to deliver, to rescue His world from slavery to death (Rom. 8:19-21).

2. The world is singing. Can we do less? For we, too, with the world, will be set free when Jesus, the Judge and Deliverer, comes. Therefore sing!

Richmond Heights, Mo.

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

RELIGIOUS REORGANIZATION AMONG THE MONTANA BLACKFEET

Under this heading the *Review of Religious Research* (summer 1960), a Catholic periodical, reports the occasional dualism of pagan and Catholic beliefs and rites among the Blackfeet Indians in Montana, numbering about 7,394. Of these 88 per cent adhere to Catholicism, while 12 per cent belong to various Protestant groups active on the reservation. Pagan Blackfeet beliefs, the article says, resemble those of other Plains Indians, but they have their distinctive characteristics. Napi, the "Old Man," was believed to be the creator of the world and all living things. After creating the world he made himself a wife who helped him design human beings; but no sooner had he taught them all they needed to survive than he climbed a high mountain and disappeared. Though he was treated with great respect, he was also considered as something of a scamp. The Blackfeet believed in supernatural powers existing on land, in the skies, and in the waters, as also in the survival of the soul after death in an existence similar to that of this earthly life. After Catholic missionaries had contacted them, they showed considerable persistence to retain remnants of their pagan beliefs, and this resulted in a fusion of Indian and Catholic religious ideas. An aged Indian thus enjoyed great prestige as a representative of the old Indian tradition. But when he became ill and the visiting priest offered him a rosary, he produced his own and led his friends in the recitation of the rosary. Thus while holding to the ancient beliefs, he was willing also to be guided by the Catholic missionary. The Indians in general do not attend Mass regularly, but they are greatly attracted to the "sacramentals," such as holy water, blessed candles, and the like, which no doubt remind them of their ancient medicine

bundles and other paraphernalia. The report does not mention any Gospel preaching by the Catholic missionaries.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

THE FEAR OF THE LORD IS THE BEGINNING OF WISDOM

On this text (Ps. 111:10) Karl Barth on July 20, 1958, preached a sermon in the prison of Basel which with other sermons Harper & Brothers intend to publish in March 1961, and which, with the permission of the publishers, *Interpretation* (October 1960) presents to its readers. To us the sermon, well translated by Marguerite Wieser, seemed remarkable for both the simplicity of diction and the relative orthodoxy of content, as this is witnessed, for example, by the following statements:

We discover that God, since the beginning of time, has not hated or threatened you and me, but has loved and chosen us, has made a covenant with us, has been our helper long before we knew it and will continue this relationship. The fear of the Lord springs from the discovery that the high and eternal God gave his beloved Son for us, for you and me, taking upon himself our sin and our misery; he made his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, himself our sin and our misery; he made his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, to be our brother, for whose sake we may call God our Father and ourselves his children. The fear of the Lord springs from the discovery that I did not merit this gift, that it has been given to me by the pure and free goodness of God, in spite of all I deserved. . . . The fear of the Lord springs from the discovery that it might be high time to awake from sleep, to arise and live as the men we really are, God's elect and chosen people, brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ, set free by him from our sin and our misery. The fear of the Lord springs from the discovery that God calls us unto himself and that his calling urges us to wake up, to arise, and to begin to live as his children.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

CONFERENCE OF EDUCATIONAL EXECUTIVES

Nearly 40 District and synodical leaders in parish education traveled to Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill., for the 39th annual meeting of the Conference of Educational Executives of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. In session Dec. 6—9, members of the conference, formerly called the superintendents' conference, explored a variety of topics under the theme "The Challenge of Christian Education for Our Day."

Conference keynote speaker was Arthur L. Miller, Executive Secretary of the Missouri Synod Board of Parish Education. Noting some implications of the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth for the church's educational efforts, the St. Louis leader encouraged conference members to remain alert to rapidly changing local, national, and world conditions.

Arthur E. Wittmer, Executive Secretary of parish education for the Synod's Atlantic District, outlined the tasks facing District educational leaders during the next decade. He urged District workers to continually discover the extent and the value of the total parish education effort and to work for improved teaching in both full-time and part-time educational agencies. While stressing the need to establish more Lutheran elementary and secondary schools, Wittmer cautioned the superintendents to "admit that many parishes cannot and should not have full-time schools." However, where studies show that a school is not possible nor feasible in a congregation, superintendents should encourage the congregation to join in an interparish school arrangement.

Oscar E. Feucht, Missouri Synod Secretary of Adult Education, explained the proposed workings of a new plan for training lay Bible class teachers in every congregation holding synodical membership. Called the Train Two Program, the plan envisions holding some

15 regional workshops during the next three years.

Remus C. Rein, executive secretary of education, missions, and stewardship for the Synod's Central Illinois District, focused conference attention on the issue of subsidizing new and existing congregations so that they may establish or maintain elementary schools. Districts should be willing to grant subsidies for schools, Rein concluded. However, such subsidies should be granted to congregations within specified limitations. "The decision to grant subsidy for a school program in a mission congregation, the amount of subsidy to be granted, and the duration of the subsidy are decisions that should be made by the District board of directors after full consultation with the District mission and education boards."

Attending conference sessions were representatives of the Synod's Board for Young People's Work and the International Walther League. William H. Kohn, Hyattsville, Md., pastor and member of the Missouri Synod Board of Directors, appealed for a "sensitive conscience" concerning the importance of youth work.

Elmer N. Witt, Walther League executive director, singled out implications of the recent Lutheran youth research findings for Lutheran education. Among other findings, these studies conducted by the Evangelical Lutheran, American Lutheran, United Evangelical Lutheran, and Lutheran Free Churches showed that Lutheran youth want help in seven areas: vocational counseling, boy-girl relationships, Christian outreach, problems with self, spiritual growth, and school and family relationships.

Conference members approved a "statement on nonsegregated education in church and state." The four key paragraphs of the statement —

Commend those citizens of the United States who are seeking to preserve and extend the public schools in keeping with the Su-

preme Court decision upholding nonsegregated and nondiscriminatory schooling.

Encourage pastors, teachers, and congregations of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod to support constructive efforts to preserve and to extend nonsegregated schooling and, where necessary, to initiate such efforts.

Encourage Missouri Synod congregations to open and expand Lutheran elementary and higher schools solely for purposes of better Christian education, not for the purpose of avoiding racially or culturally integrated schooling.

Encourage each Missouri Synod congregation to adopt as a working principle the policy of serving all people in its immediate neighborhood, also in regard to its educational agencies, particularly its elementary and higher schools.

FREDERICK NOHL

JOHN XXIII RESCINDS BAN ON VERNACULAR

The Catholic Herald for Sept. 9, 1960, somewhat belatedly discloses the contents of a letter which Pope John XXIII sent on March 31, 1960, to Maximos IV Saigh, the Melchite (Roman Catholic) Patriarch of Antioch, and in which the pope rescinded a decree of the Congregation of the Holy Office. Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Cardinal Cicognani's predecessor as Secretary of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches, had authorized Eastern rite Roman Catholic parishes in English-speaking lands to use the English language in their services. The Congregation had also authorized Roman Catholic clergymen of the Latin rite to celebrate Mass in English when they were using an Eastern rite. When a number of American and British clergymen, among them the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, availed themselves of this privilege in 1959, however, the Congregation of the Holy Office instructed the Apostolic Delegate to this country, the Most Reverend Egidio Vagnozzi, to prohibit at once any further use of English at celebrations of Mass according to an Eastern rite. Thereupon the Reverend Joseph Raya, a

Melchite priest of Birmingham, Ala., addressed himself to Patriarch Maximos, who in turn wrote a letter to Pope John on Feb. 6, 1960, in which he called attention to the fact that the directive to archbishop Vagnozzi had originated not with the Congregation for the Eastern Churches but with the Congregation of the Holy Office, which was not canonically competent to rule in this matter. In his letter of March 31 to Patriarch Maximos Pope John accordingly rescinded the prohibition. (Source: *Herder-Korrespondenz*, Vol. XV, No. 2 [November 1960], p. 61)

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

BRIEF ITEMS FROM THE NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

Evanston, Ill.—Retired Bishop Anders Nygren of Lund, Sweden, is scheduled to spend 14 months as a research scholar at the Evanston Institute for Ecumenical Studies here.

Bishop Nygren, who celebrated his 70th birthday on Nov. 15, served five years as the first president of the Lutheran World Federation after it was organized at Lund in 1947 as the successor organization to the Lutheran World Convention.

He is one of two scholars to join the Evanston Institute through a grant from the Danforth Foundation. The other is Canon Theodore Wedel, warden emeritus of the College of Preachers, Washington, D. C., who began a year of study here in September. Dr. Walter Leibrecht, a Lutheran, who has been director of the institute since it opened in 1958, said that Bishop Nygren will devote most of his time to research on the relationship of theology and contemporary philosophical thinking. In addition, however, he will also offer courses for graduate students from colleges and seminaries in the Chicago metropolitan area and will participate in various conferences sponsored by the institute.

Munich, (West) Germany.—A new the-

ological seminary to serve the territorial Lutheran churches throughout both parts of Germany was solemnly dedicated in November at Pullach, near here. Conducting the dedication was Bishop Hanns Lilje of Hannover, presiding bishop of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany (VELKD), which is sponsoring the institution. The VELKD is an all-German federation of 10 territorial churches (*Landeskirchen*) with a combined membership of about 17 million.

This is the first time in their history that the German Lutheran churches have jointly engaged in an undertaking of this sort. The new \$240,000 center, known as the Preachers' and Study Seminary, is intended for advanced theological research and teaching and for training in special kinds of religious service.

Dedication of the institution signaled the opening of its first course, in which are enrolled 20 students from West German churches. The three East German Lutheran *Landeskirchen* were not able to send students.

Copenhagen. — The road to Christian unity is a "road back" — but it is back to Christ and not back to Rome, the Lutheran World Federation's Commission on Inter-confessional Research heard here in November.

Bishop Hermann Dietzfelbinger of Munich, Germany, chairman of the commission, declared that the Biblical allusion to one flock under one shepherd referred only to Christ Himself and not to the pope. Martin Luther's work as a church reformer was begun with an ecumenical perspective, said Dr. Dietzfelbinger, whose 2.5-million-member Bavarian Evangelical Lutheran Church is situated in the most Roman Catholic part of Germany. But, he added, Luther's ecumenical goal was "back to Christ alone, to the Holy Scriptures, to faith and truth."

He contrasted this position with that of the Roman Church, which, Bishop Dietzfel-

binger said, "demands distinctly, plainly, and clearly the return to Rome" as the basis of Christian unity. "It refuses to acknowledge that it, too, can be at fault and commit errors."

While taking account of present contacts between Rome and non-Catholic churches and noting that the hopes of even Catholics had been raised by the papal announcement of an "ecumenical council," he commented, "But meanwhile it has become quite clear that Rome understands 'ecumenical' only in the sense of Roman Catholic."

Christian unity must not be an end in itself, nor must it be sought out of human enthusiasm, the German churchman asserted. "The one church must be a community in Christ as the only Savior of the world." He reiterated that for followers of the Reformation the ecumenical road is "not return to Rome, but only a return of all of us to Christ alone."

His statement as chairman at the commission sessions here, based on the theme "The One Church and the Reformation," was similar to a lecture he gave earlier at a gathering in Stuttgart.

Attending the sessions were commission members Archbishop Gunnar Hultgren of Uppsala, Primate of the (Lutheran) Church of Sweden; Etienne Jung of Strasbourg, France, president of the Directorium of the Lutheran Church of Alsace and Lorraine; Prof. Peter Brunner of the University of Heidelberg, Germany; Prof. Warren A. Quanbeck of Luther Theological Seminary, Saint Paul, Minn.; and Dr. Hans Peter Treuenfels, Lutheran layman from Norwalk, Conn. Federation staff members from Geneva who were present were Acting Executive Secretary Kurt Schmidt-Clausen, Dr. Vilmos Vajta, director of the Department of Theology, and the Rev. Jurgen Roloff, assistant to Dr. Vajta.

Parkland, Wash. — Pacific Lutheran College, the only Lutheran senior college west of the Rocky Mountains, has now assumed

full
was
Un
th
T
of
reco
bod
Aug
sch
of
with
R
tion
ther
und
ther
fall
A
"un
reci
imo
Stat
I
Cou
late
did
for
T
of M
thin
Stat
wor
sepa
sch
"I
late
as a
and
find
or p
of r
pres
T
men
U

full university status. The 70-year-old school was formally designated Pacific Lutheran University in special ceremonies during a three-day celebration here early in October.

The university is owned by a corporation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church and has received support from two other church bodies, the American Lutheran Church and Augustana Lutheran Church. Two Lutheran schools in Washington — Columbia Lutheran of Everett and Spokane College — merged with Pacific Lutheran several years ago.

Establishment of another Lutheran educational institution in the west, California Lutheran College, near Los Angeles, is now underway. It is a joint project of five Lutheran bodies and is expected to open next fall or early in 1962.

Albany, N. Y. — Legality of the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance recited by school children was upheld unanimously by the Appellate Division of the State Supreme Court here.

In affirming a 1957 decision by Supreme Court Justice Isadore Bookstein, the Appellate Division said recitation of the pledge did not involve improper use of the schools for the dissemination of "religious dogma."

The appeal had been filed by Joseph Lewis of North Salem, N. Y., president of the Free-thinkers of America, and Alfred L. Klein of Staten Island, N. Y., on the grounds that the words "under God" violated the church-state separation principle when said in public schools.

"Members of a religious sect," the Appellate Division said, "who viewed the ceremony as a form of idolatry offensive to their tenets and beliefs need not recite the pledge. We find no sound basis for any claim of coercion or pressure directed toward 'an establishment of religion' or interfering with 'the free expression thereof.'"

These references were to the First Amendment to the U. S. Constitution.

Use of the revised pledge was recom-

mended by the State Education Department after Congress had added the words "under God" in 1954. The pledge now reads: "One nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

The State Education Department, in its recommendation, had noted that children could omit the two words, remain silent throughout recitation of the pledge, or leave the room altogether.

In its ruling the Appellate Division quoted a U. S. Supreme Court decision which stated: "There cannot be the slightest doubt that the First Amendment reflects the philosophy that Church and State should be separated. The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State.

"Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. It is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise, the State and religion would be aliens to each other — hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly.

"Prayers in our legislative halls, the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive, the proclamations making Thanksgiving Day a holiday, 'so help me God' in our courtroom oaths — these and all references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting the First Amendment."

In his 1957 decision, Judge Bookstein denied the application of Mr. Lewis and Mr. Klein for an order directing the education department to delete the two words from the pledge.

Cairo. — Twenty schools operated by the Catholic Association of Free Schools in the Asyut region of Upper Egypt were closed by order of the government, it was reported here.

The government said the schools would not be permitted to open for the new academic year because teacher qualifications

and building management did not conform to the law. According to the report, three telegrams of protest sent to the government by Catholic officials failed to obtain any immediate results.

Coptic Rite Bishop Alexandros Scandar of Asyut told the faithful in a sermon: "Whatever the administrative vexations, nobody will stop Christianity from remaining in this country and even prospering."

To prevent the government from requisitioning the school buildings, the free school association plans to use them as reception centers for poor children. The children will receive catechetical instruction at the centers.

Saigon. — Two Catholic seminaries in Hanoi, North Vietnam, have been forced to close as a result of pressure from the Communist regime. Rather than include in the curriculum a Communist "culture program" as ordered by the government, seminary officials decided not to reopen the schools for the current term.

Colombo, Ceylon. — Tension mounted here and in other parts of this predominantly Buddhist country as some 2,500 private schools, mostly Roman Catholic, were formally taken over by the state.

Nationalization of the schools was approved by parliament in mid-November, and the take-over date was set for Jan. 1. However, the government later decided to change the date to Dec. 1. Meanwhile demonstrations of protests were staged, particularly by Catholic mothers who appealed in vain to Prime Minister Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike to respect the rights of parents to educate their children "in schools of our own choice."

As a precaution against further public demonstrations the government kept all the nationalized schools operating only for part of the time on the opening day. It was reported, however, that parents had moved

into some 60 Catholic schools in West Ceylon in an attempt to prevent their take-over. Catholic parents also occupied a school in Colombo. Philip Dissanayake, general manager of the Catholic schools, described the occupation of the schools as "a spontaneous protest by parents and children against the take-over."

No serious incidents were disclosed in the wake of the Catholic parents' action. Leaders of other denominations were reported by the Ceylon Radio as not opposing the government take-over. In fact, the station claimed, some of them had actually appealed to their followers to co-operate with the state in the new situation.

The Catholic schools numbered 750, with an enrollment of 250,000 pupils, of whom about 65 per cent are Catholics. Protestant schools have around 140,000 students, the great majority of whom are Buddhist or Hindu. Hindu education leaders have strongly associated themselves with Catholic leaders in opposition to the take-over of the denominational schools.

Eight primary Catholic schools that had hoped to become private institutions and thus avoid nationalization were taken by surprise when the government appropriated three kindergartens which they operated.

Meanwhile an estimated 3,000 students camped on the steps of a newspaper here in protest against the take-over. Some of them wore black ties, arm bands, and shirts and carried banners with the slogan, "Give Us Justice or Death." Parents and sympathizers distributed food packages among them.

Buddhist groups, which have long demanded state management of all schools as the first step toward framing an education system suited to the national culture, organized firecracker displays to celebrate "National Education Day."

LE
J
J
P
our
ture
of
Isra
title
war
uppe
sear
pres
and
to t
part
cede
T
Ges
from
prac
for
the
Bab
the
Klay
by S
of s
the
pray
led
cern
typo
Anci
Old
the

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

LEHRE UND WIRKLICHKEIT IN DER ALTEN WEISHEIT: STUDIEN ZU DEN SPRÜCHEN SALOMOS UND ZU DEM BUCHE HIOB. By Hartmut Gese. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958. vi and 90 pages. Paper. DM 9.00.

This careful study adds significantly to our knowledge both of the Hebrew Scriptures' indebtedness to earlier literatures and of the uniqueness of God's revelation to Israel. The "doctrine" referred to in the title is the teaching that virtue is always rewarded, while evil conduct receives its comeuppance. In the first part of his study Gese searches for the extra-Biblical origins and presuppositions of this system of rewards and punishments and studies its relationship to the Biblical Book of Proverbs. The other part treats similarly the non-Israelite antecedents of the Book of Job.

To illumine the background of Proverbs Gese chooses the well-known "instructions" from Egypt, collections of sayings offering practical and moral guidance. As parallels for the less well-known literary form of Job the author draws in several Sumerian and Babylonian texts, from which he establishes the existence of a literary species called the *Klageerhörungsparadigma*, originally devised by Sumerian scribe-teachers for the purpose of showing, by means of an example, that the innocent sufferer will be heard if he prays rightly. (The author was unfortunately led on p. 55 into a needless discussion concerning one of these texts by a wholesale typographical transposition on pp. 436 f. of *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, edited by J. B. Pritchard; cf. the corrected second edition, 1955.)

The author shows that already in Proverbs, where the influence of non-Israelite "wisdom" is strongest, the orderly system of deserts—which he traces back to Sumer—is constantly modified by the recognition that Yahweh may choose to act toward a person without reference to what that person has done and seems to deserve. And in Job the ancient literary form there adopted is actually used to overthrow, in the person of Job's friends, the whole system of order which it had been designed to promulgate; instead we are told simply that Yahweh is not bound by such rules but shows His power and His grace wherever He pleases. Thus the philosophy of the ancient sages was taken over into Israel but was also fundamentally transformed.

We may remind ourselves, however, that even the New Testament, while basing our redemption on God's sovereign act of grace in Christ Jesus, still teaches a subordinated form of the rewards-and-punishments system. We should guard therefore against seeing too sharp a contrast between the two views.

ARLIS J. EHLEN

TOWARD TOMORROW. By Martin H. Scharlemann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. 160 pages. Paper. \$1.95.

The unity in this collection of essays lies in the fact that all 11 were given in answer to felt needs of the Lutheran Church in various areas of its life and thought. Some are obviously oral presentations, others scholarly productions with careful documentation. Each is interesting reading.

Three of the essays by the very nature of

their subject (the Supreme Court school decision and the nature of scholarship) operate little with Biblical resources (though the lack of Biblical references does not mean an unbiblical cast of thought). The remainder all show the attempt patiently to hear out Scripture from a stance under it (the phrase is borrowed from p. 87) and then to apply what is heard to our church's social and theological concerns. Many thrill to this attempt.

If a minor criticism might be made, the volume would be more taut and valuable if the first two essays had been reworked into one. There is a large measure of repetition between the two. But then perhaps the church needs to be reminded twice of the theological basis for its welfare work. It may be that it was the best way "to be of service to the church in coming to grips with questions that keep confronting all of us." (P. 5)

EDGAR KRENTZ

GEDENKSCHRIFT FÜR D. WERNER ELERT: BEITRÄGE ZUR HISTORISCHEN UND SYSTEMATISCHEN THEOLOGIE. Edited by Friedrich Hübner, Wilhelm Maurer, and Ernst Kinder. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1955. 424 pages. Cloth. DM 18.50.

This volume, containing studies by outstanding Lutheran theologians, is dedicated to the memory of Werner Elert. The content of each contribution can only be indicated in this review. Leonhard Goppelt ("Church and Heresy According to Paul") points out that Paul allowed a broad variety in life and teaching as long as individual approaches were interpretation and application of the one Gospel which is the message of God's salvation. False doctrine is basically not intellectual confusion or lack of knowledge but rejection of the obedience of faith. It is reformation of the Gospel to harmonize with the world spirit. Ernst Kinder compares and contrasts Augustine's and Luther's concepts

of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world. While there are many similarities, Augustine's concept is more dualistic and tends to identify the state with the kingdom of the world, while Luther's is theocentric and regards the state as the earthly government of God by which He preserves His creation against the devil.

Elisabeth Bergsträsser examines the mono-phylitism of Philoxenus of Mabbug, finds that he strongly stresses the Incarnation against a soteriological background, but should have stressed more the forgiveness of sins. Friedrich K. Schumann analyzes the *ludus de Antichristo* of the 12th century and makes some penetrating historical applications. Martin Schmidt compares Wyclif's conception of the church with that of Augustine and Luther. Wyclif sees the church as the bride of Christ and the body of Christ and stresses *humilitas*, but places predestination in a more central position, while Luther stresses the Word as formative in the church. Holsten Fagerberg examines Luther's conception of the church in the Reformer's lectures on the Psalms. While Luther is still dependent on older tradition, even in this period he already fixed some of his basic concepts of the church. Particular attention is given to the concepts *corpus Christi*, *invisibilis* and *absconditus*. Lennart Pinomaa discusses *profectio* in Luther's thought and shows how Luther gradually gave up the idea of progressive sanctification as the way of salvation and held that growth in sanctification is growth in faith. Paul Althaus traces Luther's exegesis of 1 Cor. 13:2 until the Reformer reaches the conclusion that the "faith" there mentioned is a special, charismatic miracle-working faith. Ragnar Bring examines faith and *iustitia* in Luther's thought. He seeks to uphold the concept of *lex divina* but rejects the attempts to abstract a universally valid *lex natura*. Three factors must be considered: the kingdom of God destroyed by the Fall

but restored in Christ; the kingdom of the world ruled by Satan; the world as the object of God's earthly governance. The government of the world and the kingdom of grace are both of God. Government, however, cannot fulfill the *lex divina*. *Lex divina* as it exists in government is distorted by men. Franz Lau treats the apocalyptic, prophetic activities of Thomas Müntzer and Luther's attitude toward the Peasant Revolt. He sees the basic difference between Müntzer and Luther in the fact that Müntzer preached a social gospel while Luther was concerned with the inner man.

Wilhelm Maurer analyzes the *lex spiritualis* in Melancthon. Melancthon was at first strongly influenced by the view of Erasmus that the Law is *forma vitae* and that inwardness distinguishes the *lex spiritualis* and *lex carnalis*. Before 1521 he, however, saw that the contrast is that of the divine will and the will hostile to God. His concept of *lex spiritus*, though dependent on Luther, has a different form. Robert Stupperich shows Melancthon's interest in synods and his views on the constitutive and functional factors. Gottfried Noth analyzes Chemnitz's conception of the sin against conscience and compares and contrasts it with Luther's. Leiv Aalen analyzes the theology of Zinzendorf and shows the prominent position which the count gave to the concept of Christ as Creator, Redeemer, and Bridegroom of the soul. Theodore G. Tappert describes the pastoral care which Helmuth gave to sufferers in the yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia, 1793. Walter Kuenneth gives penetrating insights into the thought forms of faith. He shows the limitation of conceptualizations (*Bildrede*), abstractions, and *via negationis* (*Nonik*). Positively, he shows that revelation is historical, concrete, personal and that the language of Scripture, though borrowed from many sources, became *Urworte* of revelation. Peter Brunner analyzes the knowledge of God as

it is given in and outside the Scriptures. The religions apart from revelation possess truth in the form of perversion. Wolfgang Trillaas discusses the place of the Old Testament in dogmatics. He emphasizes that it shows the universality of law and gives a portrait of man. Osmo Tiilikä treats the history of salvation from the viewpoint of *καρπός* which centers in the Christ event. Max Keller-Hüschemenger shows how Johann Christian von Hofmann dealt with the problem of religious subjectivism and of religious certainty. Vilmos Vajta shows the relationship of the Holy Spirit, the holy Christian church, the communion of saints, and the forgiveness of sins in his discussion of the hidden holiness of the church. Regin Prenter treats "the real presence of Christ's body and blood on the altar and in human mouth," which Prenter calls "the content of the Lord's Supper," as the center of Christian worship. Johann D. Schmidt interprets "through Jesus Christ, our Lord," as meaning both *propter Christum* and *per Christum*. The possibility of worship is given in Christ's saving act and the reality in Christ's presence. Gerhard Gloege examines the ethos of divorce in the light of creation, redemption, and sanctification on the basis of an extensive analysis of the Old and New Testament. Hans Liermann discusses ministry and church organization. He emphasizes that the ministry represents the Word in organization. Friedrich Huebner analyzes ecumenical conferences and concludes that their chief function should be dogmatic work on the basis of Scripture. Paul Althaus evaluates Elert's theological work, and Herwig Wagner provides a list of Elert's writings.

ERWIN L. LUEKER

NIETZSCHE. By H. Van Riessen; translated by Kirk Jellema. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing House, 1960. 61 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

Van Riessen offers an interpretation of

Nietzsche from a Christian point of view. He traces very briefly the life and the limited philosophical development of the man with its culmination in "the transvaluation of all values," which means that we throw off the shackling ideas of God, truth, and morality and live without illusions and sham. This is, of course, nihilism, and Nietzsche knew it. Although somehow he wanted to rise above it, he never could. For there was no meaning in what Nietzsche himself propounded. The author asserts that Nietzsche's ridiculous caricature of Christianity is due to his atheism. Christ Crucified never fit Nietzsche's picture of Christianity as sham and pretense, however, and this haunted him all his life. Always he fought Christ, and although he rejected Him and parodied Him, yet he fed on Him like a parasite. For without Christ there is no anti-Christ, no Nietzsche, and without the Bible no Zarathustra.

This little book is readable and illuminating for one who would gain a quick synopsis of Nietzsche's thought. There is of course no substitute for going directly to Nietzsche.

ROBERT PREUS

ROMERSKT OCH EVANGELISKT. By Per Erik Persson. Lund: Gleerups, 1959. 75 pages. Paper. Swedish kronor 4:25.

In our time, Persson concedes, Roman Catholic and Lutheran theology have drawn closer together at a number of points. Nevertheless, he insists, when we compare the teaching of the Lutheran Symbols with the pronouncements of the recent popes and of contemporary Roman Catholic theologians like Schmaus, Sartory, Congar, Journet, and Semmelroth, we find the two theologies still separated by decisive cleavages in such basic issues as the nature of the Word of God, the role of tradition, and the relation of the sacred ministry to the church. The implications of these issues ultimately affect even fundamental articles of the faith that the two denominations formally hold in common,

such as the Incarnation and the activity of the Holy Spirit as Lord and Lifegiver.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

THE THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF LAW (*Le fondement théologique du droit*). By Jacques Ellul; translated by Marguerite Wieser. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960. 140 pages. Cloth. \$3.95.

The author of this essay is a distinguished Bordeaux professor of law and an ecumenically active French Reformed layman. The jacket calls the work, not unjustly, a radical critique of natural law. By Ellul's own statement, what he has written is only an introduction, "a theological undertaking proceeding to the very limits of the concrete and leaving all doors open there" (p. 139). This deliberately and exclusively theoretical approach, coupled with the author's failure at several crucial points adequately to specify his absolute presuppositions, poses problems for the reader. In the absence of a bibliography the sometimes very sketchy footnote references often defy verification. All this does not alter the fact that Ellul's energetic statement of the relation of divine law to human law and of human justice to the divine righteousness, as he sees these relations described in the Sacred Scriptures, is likely to be a highly important methodological contribution to the dialog between law and theology, although jurists will probably prize it higher than theologians. His theological approach, like that of contemporary Continental Reformed theology generally, is Bibliocentric and Christocentric. His thesis is that while "natural law" is not the *idea* that either the philosophers or the theologians of the past took it to be, "natural law" is a datum, a concrete *event* in history. Law in general, he holds, is independent not only of the state and of the church but ultimately also of man himself. "It is autonomous in regard to any human

force and hence also to nature. It depends entirely on the righteousness of God" (p. 138). It exists to remind us of essential aspects of God's righteousness and to serve God's work, the salvation of man.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

CHRISTOLOGY AND MYTH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Geraint Vaughan Jones. New York: Harper and Brothers, c. 1956. Cloth. 295 pages. \$4.50.

In a careful but rather drawn-out study this British scholar sets forth both his positive and his negative reactions to Bultmann. He agrees that mythical Christology must be interpreted and to some extent corrected. Unlike the Marburg professor-author, Jones wants to use the synoptic Jesus as a corrective to the Christology of the epistles.

It seems to be Jones' conviction that any New Testament terminology that speaks of Jesus as the eternal Creator is inevitably mythological and problematical from the standpoint of His real humanity. Ultimately, however, the author pleads rather conservatively for the necessity of myth and mythological thinking. At the same time it is doubtful whether a confessional Lutheran could regard his minimal Christianity as orthodox.

HENRY W. REIMANN

STUDIES IN LUTHERAN DOCTRINE. By Paul F. Keller, Elmer Foelber, Harry Coiner, and others. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. 212 pages. Paper.

This is the revised edition of the original production by Sacred Design Associates, noted for its adaptations of prints by Albrecht Dürer. Apparently intended for standard age confirmation classes, some teachers might desire more "interest catchers" and "young teen talk" in the manuscript than what is provided.

A greater abundance of "learning activities" — along the project line — would

further enhance the work. And more of the excellent Dürer prints (there are a meager six in the book, plus cover) would no doubt be warmly received. For the mass media have made their successful appeal to our youth and *trained* them to react to the *colorful* word and picture; and page upon page of type relatively unbroken by illustration can be unappealing for even the 13-year-old.

Nevertheless the composite work of the authors has produced a helpful new manual for the instructor. The doctrinal exposition is traditional and thorough. The type is commendably large, with ample space for marginal notes. Pages 149—212 comprise exercises on the various lessons. These also serve to prepare the student for the three comprehensive examinations which utilize multiple choice method, available at 10 cents each, with a correction key and profile chart an additional 10 cents each.

DONALD L. DEFFNER

JESUS AND THE WORD. By Rudolf Bultmann. Translated from the German by Louise Pettibone Smith and Erminie Huntress Lantero. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c. 1958. 226 pages. Paper. \$1.50.

This is the student's paper-book edition of the 1934 English translation of Bultmann's early (1926) classic *Jesus*. It is to be hoped that those who pontificate about the greatness — or the errors — of Bultmann without any firsthand knowledge of the Marburg professor will read this beautifully translated volume. Here in wonderful simplicity is not so much the critical technique or even the radical program of demythologization (although both can be discerned) as a theological summary of the *teaching* of Jesus. If one wishes to know why Bultmann is often regarded as the greatest teacher of justification by grace through faith (next to St. Paul and Luther), the evidence is here.

At the same time no one reads far without discovering the Marburger's emphatic commitment to existentialism.

HENRY W. REIMANN

THE IMPUTATION OF ADAM'S SIN. By John Murray. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., c. 1959. 95 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

This book brings together articles published by Westminster Seminary's Murray in four issues of the *Westminster Theological Journal* (XVIII, 2; XIX, 1 and 2; XX, 1). The material is an extremely precise exegetical, systematic, and polemic treatment of Rom. 5:12 and its context in which the author argues once again some classic disputes in Reformed Orthodoxy. His conclusions are that the one trespass of Adam is the sin of all because of the covenant headship (not merely the natural headship as espoused by William Shedd and A. H. Strong), imputed directly and not mediately through depravity (as espoused by 17th century Joshua Placcus) and brought to bear upon Adam's posterity in such a way that the judgment upon them is the judgment which Adam's disobedience demands.

Certainly there is here much material that is highly useful for a Lutheran systematician. The publisher has wisely included many Latin footnotes which give the sources in Reformed Orthodoxy. One is, however, somewhat saddened at the near-rationalistic search for the precise mode of the imputation of Adam's sin. Unfortunately it seems that except for cautious brilliance at the extreme end of the book, where "depravity" is championed as an implicit rather than as a consequent of the imputation of guilt, Murray himself has put together an extremely long list of logical connectives ("What is required to explain," "we must assume," "it does not follow," etc., etc.). As a result the Biblical methodology seems a strange mixture of atomism that looks only to Romans 5

to settle issues and "speculation" that argues from narrow premises to some fairly complicated systematic conclusions. It seems evident, then, that even the most professed Biblical theologians can become speculative, especially as they engage in polemics, and perhaps a study of this book will show a Lutheran similar complexities in his own history. The single reference Murray makes to Lutheran theology on the correlation of *culpa* and *poena* (p. 83 f.) makes it appear that this similarity to the Reformed view of imputation is but typical of other agreements. But no one who knows the Augsburg Confession, and the Apology, and the Smalcald Articles and their treatment of original sin can be happy with this Reformed precision which, distinguishing so sharply between original and actual sin, insists that original sin is not personal or voluntary.

HENRY W. REIMANN

JESUS CHRIST AND MYTHOLOGY. By Rudolf Bultmann. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c. 1958. 96 pages. Cloth. \$1.95.

This small volume contains the lectures delivered by Bultmann at various American universities and seminaries in the fall of 1951. The book is a capsuled defense of the author's understanding of the eschatological message of Jesus and the necessity for its demythologization. Briefly but cogently Bultmann answers his critics as follows. Instead of rationalizing the Christian message, demythologizing makes clear the meaning of God's mystery by interpreting the mythological elements that remain from a long-lost world view. We learn from existentialist philosophy, but this is not yet *das Existentielle* of God acting for me. This latter is not any problematic mythological language. What would be are statements which speak of God's actions as cosmic events, and these, Bultmann holds, are illegitimate.

The author's consistent presupposition is

that
only
fact
W
is a
(p.
only
(p.
His
glori
Wor
study
Bult
delp

THE
ric
m
\$3
TH

text
deav
the m
ciples
Chris
ciples
ship
(p. 5)
and
(p. 5)
cause
"Unb
Throu
grace
For e
end to
life, b
When
and d
—dea
old m
ductor
hoeffer
hope f
a new

that the Scriptures are the Word of God only when heard as an address to me. "The fact that the word of Scripture is God's Word cannot be demonstrated objectively; it is an event which happens here and now" (p. 71). The "Word of God is what it is only in the moment in which it is spoken" (p. 79). And this means that Jesus Christ, His person, His coming, His passion, His glorification, is in the here and now as the Word is preached. This is a useful book to study alongside of Wingren's critique of Bultmann in *Theology in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958).

HENRY W. REIMANN

THE COST OF DISCIPLESHIP. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. 285 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

This revised edition now contains the full text of *Nachfolge* (1937). The book endeavors to present a true understanding of the mutual relation between grace and discipleship. "Christianity without the living Christ is inevitably Christianity without discipleship, and Christianity without discipleship is always Christianity without Christ" (p. 50). "Only he who believes is obedient, and only he who is obedient believes" (p. 54). Grace is not cheap but costly, because it radically affects the whole existence. "Unbelief thrives on cheap grace" (p. 59). Throughout the book the emphasis upon grace and discipleship is radically stated. For example: "The cross is not the terrible end to an otherwise god-fearing and happy life, but it meets us at the beginning. . . . When Christ calls a man he bids him come and die . . . it is the same death every time—death in Jesus Christ, the death of the old man at his call" (p. 79). In the introductory memoir, G. Leitholz contends: "Bonhoeffer's life and death have given us great hope for the future. He has set a model for a new type of true leadership inspired by

the gospel, daily ready for martyrdom and death." Bonhoeffer was executed at the Nazi concentration camp at Flossenbug on April 9, 1945, by special order of Himmler.

ERWIN L. LUEKER

THE GOSPEL OF GOD. By Herbert Kelly. London: SCM Press, 1959. 151 pages. Cloth. 10/6.

The life of the remarkable Anglican who founded the Society of the Sacred Mission (Kelham) and was a legend when he died a nonagenarian in 1950, is treated in a competent 30-page biographical sketch by George Every. Kelly's 1928 *Gospel of God* demonstrates how idealistic religion can be sympathetically but ruthlessly exposed for the egotism it is, and yet in such a way that not only are both the author and reader brought under judgment, but they are brought to the wonderfully simple "Gospel of God." Kelly asked the questions: Does God do anything? Or is God only a name for ideals? He replied that while the soul seeks for God, the God that the self chooses is only a self-chosen God. The story of the Gospel, centered in the crucifixion, is the answer Kelly gives to his own ultimate questions and this he hands on, like Barth, to fellow idealists. HENRY W. REIMANN

HOW TO WORK WITH TEEN-AGE GROUPS. By Dorothy M. Roberts. New York: Association Press, 1959. 62 pages. Paper. \$1.00.

This is a practical, "how-to" book, loaded with insights and pointers on approaching our teen-agers. Several pertinent books and research studies are cited. The style is fresh and to the point, the material well organized. The book is small but packed with help (i. e., "Ten Basic Needs," "What Youth Hopes for in an Adult Leader," "An Interest Finder," etc.). The hesitant adviser approaching work with the "teens" will find it well worth his dollar! DONALD L. DEFFNER

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF COUNSELING.

By Clyde M. Narramore. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960. 303 pages. Cloth. \$3.95.

This is a counseling book written by a Christian clinical psychologist for pastors and other professional church workers. The first part of the book discusses basic concepts and techniques of counseling. The second part takes up specific areas, e.g., teen-agers, the mentally and emotionally ill, marriage, and sex. An appendix includes a treatment of the use of the Scriptures in counseling,

a useful glossary of terms, and a bibliography.

The author presents a sane, comprehensive, and Christian approach to counseling. On the basis of his experience in conducting seminars with pastors around the country, he treats a wide range of practical problems in a straightforward, intelligible way. One would have liked to see a fuller appreciation of the problems of relating spiritual counseling with psychological insights, but this defect does not limit the practical value of this book. KENNETH H. BREIMEIER

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of a book in this list acknowledges its receipt and does not preclude further discussion of its contents in the Book Review section)

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. By William M. Ramsay. Third edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. xxviii and 402 pages. Paper. \$2.59. An unaltered photolithoprinted reissue of the 1897 edition of a work upon which the author's prestigious reputation largely came to rest.

Medieval Philosophy. By Frederick C. Copleston. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961. 194 pages. Paper. \$1.35. Copleston's survey, first published in London in 1952, fully justifies the wider attention this paperback reissue will give it. It is one of the most capably constructed introductions to medieval philosophy to be produced in English in recent decades.

Education at the Crossroads. By Jacques Maritain. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1960. viii and 120 pages. Paper. \$1.25. An unaltered reprint of the 1943 edition, of which it is the 11th printing.

The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches (Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen). Vol. I, 448 pages, \$2.25; Vol. II, 571 pages, \$2.45. By Ernst Troeltsch; translated by Olive Wyon. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. Paper. This is a "Torchbook" reissue of Miss Wyon's

1931 translation of the 1911 German edition. H. Richard Niebuhr provides a five-page introduction which puts this "potent book" into historical perspective for the reader who approaches it half a century after its original publication.

Experiments and Observations on the Gastric Juice and the Physiology of Digestion. By William Beaumont. New York: Dover Publications, 1959. xi and 280 pages. Paper. \$1.50. A facsimile of the original edition of 1833, plus a biographical essay, "A Pioneer American Physiologist," from the pen of Sir William Osler in appreciation of one of the country's great Army surgeons.

Famous Archaeological Discoveries. By Merrill F. Unger. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960. 79 pages. Paper. \$1.00. An unaltered reprint of 11 chapters (on the Rosetta and Moabite Stones, Hezekiah's tunnel inscription, the Hurrians and the Hittites, Tutankhamen's tomb, Ur, the Ras Shamra and Nuzi tablets, Mari, the Lachish letters, and the Qumran scrolls) from the author's book of four years ago, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*.

A History of Ancient Geography: Among the Greeks and Romans from the Earliest Ages Till the Fall of the Roman Empire.

By
pag
edit
c. 1
80
class
the
pear
reiss
W.

Y
T. B
[19
Afte
thor
this
eithe
that
expe
"and
meta

So
Clen
1960
An u
1942

R
the F
Bick
Press
\$2.25

A
Bode
and 2

Bi
trist
nung
melch
Comp
Price

Di
Sinn
Karl
Witte
Cloth

Th
and 1
Haver
265 p

By E. H. Bunbury. Vol. I: xxxvi and 666 pages; Vol. II: xviii and 743 pages. Second edition. New York: Dover Publications, c. 1959. Cloth. \$12.50 a set. After almost 80 years the second edition of one of the classic works on the history of geography in the Graeco-Roman world makes its reappearance in an unaltered photolithoprinted reissue with an introductory appreciation by W. H. Stahl of Brooklyn College.

Yoga: A Scientific Evaluation. By Kovoort T. Behanan. New York: Dover Publications [1959]. xx and 270 pages. Paper. \$1.65. After more than two decades, the Indian author of this study asserts in his preface to this new edition, he sees no reason to revise either his approach to yoga or the conclusions that he set forth in 1937. He calls for "more experimental work" in connection with yoga "and less mysterymongering and grandiose metaphysical speculation."

Source Book of Medical History, ed. Logan Clendening. New York: Dover Publications, 1960. xiv and 685 pages. Paper. \$2.75. An unabridged and unaltered reprint of the 1942 edition.

Rome. By M. Rostovtzeff; translated from the Russian by J. D. Duff; edited by Elias J. Bickerman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960. xiii and 347 pages. Paper. \$2.25.

Animal and Man in Bible Lands. By F. S. Bodenheimer. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960. viii and 232 pages. Cloth. 36 guilders.

Bibliographia Patristica: Internationale patristische Bibliographie. Vol. II: *Die Erscheinungen des Jahres 1957*, ed. W. Schneemelcher. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1959. xxx and 115 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

Die Auferstehung Jesu: Form, Art und Sinn der urchristlichen Osterbotschaft. By Karl Heinrich Rengstorff. Fourth edition. Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1960. 172 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

The Christian Idea of Education: Papers and Discussions, ed. Edmund Fuller. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960. xv and 265 pages. Paper. \$1.45.

Perspective for Renewal. By Mary Perkins Ryan. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1960. v and 94 pages. Cloth. \$2.25.

Late Renaissance and Baroque Music (c. 1525—c. 1750). By Alec Harman and Anthony Milner. Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, 1959. ix and 330 pages. Cloth. \$7.00.

Constantinople in the Age of Justinian. By Glanville Downey. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960. xiii and 181 pages. Cloth. \$2.75.

How to Improve Your Mind (De Intellectus Emendatione). By Baruch Spinoza; translated by R. H. M. Elwes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. 90 pages. Board. \$2.75.

Essays in Metaphysics (Identität und Differenz). By Martin Heidegger; translated by Kurt F. Leidecker. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. 82 pages. Board. \$2.75.

The Diary of Søren Kierkegaard. Translated from the Danish by Gerda M. Anderson; edited by Peter P. Rohde. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. 255 pages. Board. \$4.75.

Why Christians Crack Up: The Causes of and Remedies for Nervous Trouble in Christians. By Marion H. Nelson. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 125 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Theologie: Seit dem deutschen Idealismus. By Horst Stephan; second edition by Martin Schmidt. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. xv and 393 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

The Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version: Reference Edition with Concise Concordance. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1960. xiii and 1,487 pages and 12 maps. Leather. Price not given.

Church Education for Tomorrow. By Wesner Fallaw. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960. 219 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

Rabbinische Texte: Die Tosefta. Band VI: *Seder Toharot. Heft X/XI: Negaim.* Edited by Walter Windfuhr. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1960. xvi and 96 pages. Paper. DM 9.00.

Newman the Theologian: The Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Works (Neuman: Le Developpement du Dogme). By J. H. Walgrave; translated by A. V. Littledale. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960. xi and 378 pages. Cloth, \$8.50.

Seven Books of Wisdom. By Roland E. Murphy. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1960. x and 163 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

Growth in Your Christian Ministry. By Melvin L. Hodges. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 63 pages. Paper. Price not given.

Jean-Paul Sartre: To Freedom Condemned: A Guide to His Philosophy. By Justus Streller; translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. 163 pages. Board. \$3.00.

Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum. Vol. II, ed. Victor A. Tcherikover and Alexander Fuks. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960. xvi and 283 pages. Cloth. \$12.00.

According to Mark: A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel. By Philip Carrington. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960. xi and 384 pages. Cloth. \$9.50.

The Resurrection: A Biblical Study (La Resurrection de Jesus, mystère de salut). By F. X. Durrwell; translated by Rosemary Sheed. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960. xxvi and 371 pages. Cloth. \$6.00.

Beatitudo och Sapientia: Augustinus och de antika filosofskolornas diskussion om människans livsmål. By Ragnar Holte. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrrelsens Bokförlag, 1958. 416 pages. Paper. Swedish kronor 30.00.

Call to Worship. By Neville Clark. London: SCM Press (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson), 1960. 67 pages. Paper. \$1.75.

Das Buch Jesaja. Vol. I: Kapitel 1—23. By Georg Fohrer. Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1960. vii and 244 pages. Boards. Sw. Fr. 10.80.

Community, State and Church: Three Essays. By Karl Barth. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1960. 193 pages. Paper. 95 cents.

The Dimensional Structure of Time, Together with the Drama and Its Timing. By Irvin Morgenstern. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. 174 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

The Age of Martyrs: Christianity from Diocletian to Constantine (Era dei Martiri). By Giuseppe Ricciotti; translated by Anthony Bull. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1959. viii and 305 pages. Cloth. \$4.95.

Eutychus (and His Pin), ed. Edmund P. Clowney. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960. 102 pages. Board. \$2.50.

The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary Logical and Historical. By James M. Stiffler. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 256 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

The Mute Stones Speak: The Story of Archaeology in Italy. By Paul MacKendrick. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1960. xiii and 369 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

Biblical Faith and Social Ethics. By E. Clinton Gardner. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. xi and 386 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

Hand in Hand: Mother, Child and God. By Laura Margaret Evans. Westwood, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1960. 122 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

A Theology of Proclamation. By Dietrich Ritschl. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960. 190 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization. By John U. Nef. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. xv and 164 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

The Threshold of Christianity: Between the Testaments. By Lawrence E. Toombs. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960. 96 pages. Cloth. \$1.50.

The Fifteenth-Century Book: The Scribes; The Printers; The Decorators. By Curt F. Bühler. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960. 195 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

John Dewey: His Thought and Influence, ed. John Blewett. New York: Fordham University Press, 1960. xiv and 242 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

e, To-
g. By
phical
.75.

from
artiri).
Anthony
Com-
Cloth.

and P.
dmans
pages.

men-
es M.
256

ry of
derrick.
ii and

By E.
er &
Cloth.

God.
N. J.:
122

etrich
1960.

Civil-
Har-
pages.

tween
ombs.
. 96

ribes;
rt F.
nsyl-
5.00.

ence,
Uni-
pages.